

THE  
CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

No. 73.]

JANUARY, 1808.

[No. 1. Vol. VII.]

Religious Communications.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

SIR,

I SHALL begin my reply to Talib's letter by acknowledging the errors into which I believe myself to have fallen. This, I trust, I shall never be unwilling to do, when I am convinced that I have been mistaken. For pertinacity in *known* error has always appeared to me the most absurd of all absurdities: and even too great a tenaciousness of opinion ought to be guarded against by those who write on so very difficult a subject as prophecy.

1. He is right in saying that I have used two different modes of computing the 1260 days, and the larger number mentioned in Dan. viii. I certainly was not aware of it; and I believe I am by no means singular in falling into this mistake, which Talib so justly points out.

2. Such a mistake in itself is sufficient to shew that I have erred in the date of the larger number. But I was convinced that I had erred in this point even before I had seen Talib's letter, and shall make the necessary correction in the next edition of my work. My date *excluded* from the vision a certain period of the ram's conquests, which ought to have been *included* in it; because Daniel *saw* the ram pushing. Yet these conquests cannot mean the conquests of Cyrus, as I had once supposed they chiefly did; because they are placed during the time that the ram was *standing*, and *posterior* to his having two horns. On these grounds I was mistaken. The question in Dan. viii. 13, as Mr. Wintle rightly observes, respects the duration of the vision. Any date therefore which

*excludes* a part of the vision is inadmissible. When Daniel beheld the ram, he had *already* two horns, and was *already* standing: *afterwards* he saw him push. The date therefore of the vision cannot be *prior* to the death of Darius the Mede, by which event the two kingdoms became united; nor *posterior* to some remarkable pushings of the ram, which Daniel afterwards *saw*. As for the horns, Daniel did not *see* them come up, though he gives us their history. The vision opens with the ram *already* having them.

In these matters I allow myself to have been mistaken: in the other points I do not.

1. Talib seems to me to be wrong in supposing Dan. vii. 25, 26, 27, to describe *three* successive periods. That ver. 25 relates to the period of 1260 days, and ver. 27 to the millenium, few will deny; but that ver. 26 relates *exclusively* to the intermediate period either of 30 or 75 days, I must beg leave to controvert. Talib imagines that the judgment began to sit in the year 1792, when he supposes the 1260 days to have expired. I, on the contrary, contend that it began to sit long before, at least as early as the reformation, if not earlier: and I think that the very phraseology of the prophet proves me to be right. The taking away of the horn's dominion is to be gradual. It is to be consumed and destroyed *unto the end*; its destruction therefore is plainly to *commence before* the end. But by *the end*, or *the time of the end*, I think I have sufficiently shewn that we are to understand *the short intermediate period which begins at the termination of the 1260 days*: at least Talib has not attempted to

confute me. This being the case, since the destruction commences *before* the end of the 1260 days, ver. 26 plainly cannot be *exclusively* referred to the short period which succeeds the 1260 days. Such I conceive to be a sufficient answer to Talib's last paragraph immediately preceding his signature. My idea of ver. 26 is stated in my Dissert. Vol. I. p. 119, and Vol. II. p. 397; but I was guilty of a slight inaccuracy of expression in Vol. I. p. 226.

2. Talib's mode of arguing, that the 1260 days must have expired in the year 1792, because the papal power was then wonderfully diminished, and because the power of the Pope was greater in the time of Justinian than it is now, seems to me wholly inconclusive. The papal power received a severe blow at the reformation: it has received another severe blow at the French Revolution. But it does not therefore follow that the 1260 days expired at either of those eras. I only consider both those events as *steps* towards *entirely* taking away its dominion, as predicted in ver. 26. So again, the very argument which Talib deduces from *the extent* of the papal power, is used by Mr. Butt, to prove that the 1260 days expired in the year 1697, at the peace of Ryswick. But the same argument can scarcely be allowed to prove *two different* opinions. Indeed both these supposed terminations, not to adduce various other arguments against them, are deficient in a very material point. According to Mede and others of our best commentators, and according to the most natural import of the passage, we may collect from Dan. xii. 1, 6, 7, that the Jews will cease to be scattered, or begin to be restored, at the close of the three times and a half: but the Jews have not yet begun to be restored, therefore the three times and a half have not expired.

3. With respect to Talib's supposed commencement of the 1260 days, he has adduced no arguments in favour of it but what Mr. Bicheno

had already adduced, and which I have answered in my reply to him. Justinian never granted to the Pope any power that answers to *the giving the saints into the hand of the little horn*. The Pope had no more power given him over the *other patriarchs*, than the other patriarchs over *him*. They were wholly independent of each other. Appeals lay from bishops to archbishops, and from archbishops to their respective patriarchs: but no appeal lay from one patriarch to another; the Pope had no paramount authority. His title of *head of the churches* was a mere title of precedence. Justinian's promise, indeed, to reduce all the eastern churches under his jurisdiction, when viewed in *the abstract*, seems to be of prime importance: but, to understand what was meant, the *occasion* of the emperor's letter ought to be considered. There had long been a dispute between Rome and Constantinople respecting the diocese of Illyricum. Rome claimed it as occidental; Constantinople as oriental. The matter was referred to the emperor. He decided in favour of Rome: and wrote to the Pope, promising to reduce under his jurisdiction all the oriental churches; that is to say, all those concerning which there had been a dispute, namely, all the churches of the oriental diocese of Illyricum. This interpretation is no gloss of mine to serve a turn. If Talib will carefully read Dr. Brett's *Authority of the Church not Romish*, who has discussed the grant of Justinian not as an expositor of prophecy, but merely as a civilian, he will find that he is treading on no very secure ground. Indeed the conduct of Gregory the Great is one of the best possible comments on the *nature* of this grant: he flourished only about sixty years after the publication of the *Novellæ*: consequently, the nature of the grant, whatever it was, *must* in *his* time have been well understood at Rome. It is plain, however, that the emperor was not *then* supposed to have granted to the Pope any thing like



*universal episcopacy*; because Gregory declares, in an epistle now extant, that whoever either calls himself *universal bishop*, or desires in the pride of his heart to be so called, is the forerunner of Anti-Christ. How will Talib account for this language of Gregory, according to *his* interpretation? Does it not clearly prove that Dr. Brett's view of the grant is much more just than *his*? Accordingly Mr. Gibbon observes, that although the great power of Gregory might countenance the *more lofty* pretensions of *succeeding* popes, his own *ecclesiastical* jurisdiction was confined to the triple character of Bishop of Rome, Primate of Italy, and Apostle of the West. Talib says that the grant of Phocas rests on doubtful authority, but he does not notice *one* of my arguments in favour of it. It is asserted by two authors, who flourished not very long after the transaction; and why we should refuse to believe them, I am unable to discover. However Talib may build on the "yet preserved" grant of Justinian, it is certain that universal episcopacy *was not* claimed by the Pope in the time of Gregory; and it is equally certain that it *was* claimed in the course of the seventh century. Why then is that authority to be called doubtful, which, without any particular inducement to falsify history, refers us to an era about which we are absolutely certain that it *must* have been claimed?

4. Talib justly remarks, that I have incautiously used two different modes of computation. The question is, *which* of these two is the right one? He certainly appears to me to have pitched precisely upon the wrong one. The period assigned for the dominance of tyrannical superstition is indifferently expressed by 1260 days, 42 months, and *three years and a half*. Talib argues, that these 1260 days are no more than about 1259 days, on the principle of our Lord being said to be three days in the grave; and consequently, if they be computed from the year 606, that they will terminate in the year 1865.

If this be valid, then by the same rule, the 42 months are only about 41 months; and the three years and a half, only about two years and a half, or at the most about three years. I would ask Talib then to tell me, *what* is the precise length of the period in question? If he compute the 1260 days in the manner which *he* says is the right one, he must, to be consistent, compute the 42 months and the three years and a half in the *same* manner: but, if he compute the two latter modes of numeration in the manner which *I* say is the right one, then he must plainly compute the 1260 days likewise in the *same* manner. I might further ask Talib, how, upon *his* plan, he understands the numbers mentioned in Dan. ix. 24—27, and Rev. ix. 5, 15; but I have perhaps said sufficient already. His mode of computation then being erroneous, even supposing there were no other objections, his 1260 days will *not* terminate in 1792, but in 1793.

5. The date which he assigns to the larger period, and the reasons which he gives for assigning it, appear to me altogether unsatisfactory. It is surely very improbable, that one of Daniel's great periods should be computed from the expulsion of Hippias. That is not an event either of sufficient magnitude and notoriety, or of a sufficiently peculiar nature to be assumed as a scriptural date. In my own mind at least all Talib's arguments work not the slightest conviction.

6. Talib is aware, that his scheme makes the 1260 days end with the second woe-trumpet and at the commencement of the third; but he perhaps may *not* be aware of the difficulties which he has to remove previous to the adoption of it. Mr. Mede, I know, is of the same opinion; but the reason is this. He supposes the last trumpet to *synchronize* with the last vial, and makes the six first vials *precede* the last trumpet. Such being the case, he *necessarily* made the 1260 days to terminate as he did; and I believe him to be right in

making them terminate at the effusion of the last *vial*, though not at the sounding of the last *trumpet*. Talib ought to have attended to the note at p. 391 of my first volume. If however the 1260 days terminate at the effusion of the last vial, they cannot have terminated as yet, because the last vial is not yet poured out. Talib does not controvert the propriety of my explanation of *the time of the end*. The last vial however seems plainly to synchronize with Dan. xi. 40—45. xii. 1, supposing that explanation to be the right one. Therefore, since the time of the end commences at the expiration of the 1260 days, the last vial must likewise be poured out at their expiration. But it is not yet poured out. Consequently they have not yet expired.

7. As he has said nothing determinate against my explanation of the he-goat's little horn, has attended to none of my arguments, and has answered not one of my objections to Bishop Newton's scheme, I feel some difficulty in knowing what reply to make. He surely ought not to have been satisfied with merely telling us that "he prefers" Bishop Newton's interpretation of the symbol. He ought either to have fully met the question as I have done, or else have been silent. The same remark applies to a part of Mr. Arthur Aikin's critique on the controversy between Mr. Whitaker and myself. He allows us to be two very redoubtable champions; but *thinks* that a stripling in the armour of truth would vanquish us both. So he may *think*. He himself, however, who *ex officio* must be deemed *no* stripling, has at least displayed *the prudence* of criticism by declining to descend into the arena, though he may not have shewn much of its *liberality*. I would not be understood to put Talib on the same footing with this gentleman: I would only remind him, that such compendious refutations as *I prefer, I conceive, I think*, can never be esteemed legitimate. Many parts of his paper do much credit to his acuteness: but

here nothing is tangible, save a hesitating quere, whether Dan. xi. 31, may not have a double reference, first to *the taking of Jerusalem by Titus*, and secondly to *Justinian's declaring the Pope to be head of the church*? To this conjecture my third principle affords a sufficient answer, *No one link of a chronological prophecy is capable of receiving its accomplishment in more than one event*.

I do not think that any part of your correspondent Socius's second letter requires an answer, except his additional criticism on the word *ποινον*. Without entering further into the merits of the question, I shall only observe that I have to thank him for leading me to re-consider the passage. And the consequence of that re-consideration is my conviction, that *ποινον* ought to be referred, not to the image, but to the second beast. I translate the passage as follows: "And it was given unto him to give life unto the beast's image, in order that the beast's image might even speak, and in order that he might cause, that as many as would not worship the beast's image should be slain. And he causes, &c." In this construction of the passage I am supported by the context. Since *ποινον* ought to be referred to the second beast, such is likewise the most natural reference of *ποινον*. And indeed, if it be referred to the image, the apostle certainly employs a very unusual phraseology. Had such been his intention, he would surely have said "that the beasts image might cause that as many as would not worship *it* should be slain," not "that the beast's image might cause that as many as would not worship *the beast's image* might be slain." I am likewise supported in this construction of it by Dr. Doddridge and Archdeacon Woodhouse, who both understand it as I now do. I am, &c.

G. S. FABER.

Stockton, Dec. 18, 1807.



To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

SIR,

ON considering the critical remarks of your correspondent J. S. upon Isaiah liii. in your number for October, p. 638, the following objections to the peculiar translation of the Hebrew pronoun אלה, which he proposes, occurred to my mind. J. S. quoting the authority of Parkhurst, refers to several passages of the Old Testament, in which this pronoun should be rendered the *Eternal One*, or *God*\*. He also quotes some Jewish prayers from Buxtorf, in which this word is used in the same sense.

I agree with J. S. in considering אלה as a name of God in these texts; but this peculiar meaning of the word is pointed out by the remarkable construction in which the word is used. It is in each instance the predicate of a proposition, of which God is the subject. Deut. xxxii. 39, אלהי אלהי הוא, "I, even I am *He*." Isaiah xliii. 10, "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord—that ye may understand אלהי הוא, that I am *He*." ver. 13. "Yea, before the day was, אלהי הוא, I am *He*. And also in chap. xlviii. 12, (misprinted in your number lxviii. 12). Ps. cii. 28, ואתה הוא. "But thou art *He*, and thy years shall not end." A similar construction is also to be found in the Jewish prayers quoted to support this sense of the word. In these and other passages of the same nature which may be produced, the word אלה evidently and necessarily denotes some name or attribute of God, and may, agreeably to its radical meaning, be rendered the *Eternal One*, or the *Existing Being*, κατ'εξοχην. But in Isaiah liii. this pronoun is used as the nominative case to verbs, precisely in the same manner as in those innumerable passages where it must necessarily refer to mere men. J. S. observes that "the word אלה being equivalent to יהוה *Jehovah*, the Eternal God, is in this chapter appro-

\* There is a typographical error in the quotations in your No. p. 639, col. 1. l. 18. for *Hos.* read *Hore*.

priated to that act of Godhead, the bearing of sin, in such a manner, that it is no where used except in connection with the bearing of sin expressed, or (what is the same) *vicarious sufferings*." After quoting two passages to prove this circumstance, he adds, "In the 7th verse, 'He was oppressed, and *he* was afflicted,' where the second 'He' has אלה to answer to it, it may be supposed that this hypothesis is overturned. It would be entirely so (it is confessed) if *this* were the *right translation*. But it is clear that Bishop Lowth's is the right one, who renders it thus: 'It was exacted, and *He* was made answerable.'" Now it appears to me that, allowing Lowth's translation to be the true one, which I do not dispute, it affords no support to your correspondent's hypothesis. The verb נגש, according to this translation, is an impersonal verb; נגשה is a personal one. Now in order to mark this difference, it was *necessary* to introduce some substantive or pronoun before the last verb as its nominative, and the pronoun אלה was that which obviously presented itself. To make the necessity of the pronoun being here introduced plainer to the English reader, let us suppose the passage to be found without it in the original. It must have been translated either "He was oppressed and afflicted," or, taking the *first* verb as an impersonal one, and *both* in the sense which Lowth adopts, "It was exacted, and made answerable." Here every one must see the *necessity* of prefixing the proper nominative to the last verb, in order to shew of whom it is predicated; or, in other words, who it is that *was made answerable*. If these premises be well founded, it follows that no argument in favour of that peculiar meaning of אלה, for which J. S. contends, can be drawn from the manner in which it is used in the 7th, or the other verses of this chapter.

Far be it from me to undervalue any scriptural argument, in proof or support of a doctrine so essential to Christianity as that of the Divinity

of the Son of God. But the more important this doctrine is, the more cautious we should be of building it upon an unstable foundation, and of supporting it by feeble props.

The foregoing observations were suggested to me by an examination of those passages *only* of the Hebrew Scriptures to which J. S. refers. Additional light would doubtless be thrown upon this subject by a more extensive investigation.

ALBANUS.

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

SIR,

THE doctrine which your correspondent J. S. has illustrated in a former number of the *Christian Observer*, is so important, and his application of that doctrine to the 53d chapter of Isaiah so interesting, that I thought a strong confirmation of the use of the word *אֱלֹהִים* for one of the names of God, or as eminently significant of God in various passages of the Old Testament, would be acceptable to him and his readers. This meaning of the word *אֱלֹהִים* is confirmed by the following authority: Glassii *Philologia Sacra*, T. I. p. 153. ed. Dathe; Elsner, *Observ. Sacrae*, T. II. p. 421. Wolfii *Cura Philolog.* T. V. p. 256. Dindorfii *Lexicon Heb.* V. *אֱלֹהִים*, No. 2. and Schleusner's *Lex. Nov. Test.* V. *Αυτος*, No. 8.

A. B.

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

SIR,

THE following Extracts may not be unacceptable to the *Christian Observer*, on account of the sentiments which they contain; but more especially are they valuable because they are taken from a posthumous volume of sermons, limited in its circulation, and composed by the celebrated Dr. PALEY.

"The cause of salvation is the free will, the free gift, the love and mercy of God. That alone is the source and fountain and cause of salvation, the origin from which it springs,

from which all our hopes of attaining to it are derived. This cause is not in ourselves, nor in any thing that we do, or can do, but in God, in his good-will and pleasure. Therefore whatever shall have moved and excited and conciliated that good-will and pleasure, so as to have procured that offer to be made, or shall have formed any part or portion of the motive from which it was made, may most truly and properly be said to be efficacious in human salvation. This efficacy is in scripture attributed to the death of Christ. It is attributed in a variety of ways of expression; but this is the substance of them all. He is a sacrifice; an offering to God; a propitiation; the precious sacrifice fore-ordained; the lamb slain from the foundation of the world; the lamb which taketh away the sins of the world: we are washed in his blood; we are justified by his blood; we are saved from wrath through him; he hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. All these terms, and many more that are used, assert in substance the same thing, namely, the efficacy of the death of Christ in the procuring of human salvation."—p. 311, 312.

"There is in the nature of things, one train of sentiment belonging to him who has achieved a work by his own might and power and prowess; and another to him, who has been fain to beg for succour and assistance, and by that assistance alone has been carried through difficulties, which were too great for his own strength and faculties. This last is the true sentiment for us. It is not for a man, whose life has been saved in a shipwreck by the compassionate help of others; it is not for a man, so saved, to boast of his own alertness and vigour, though it be true that unless he had exerted what power and strength he was possessed of, he would not have been saved at all."—p. 394, 395.

"He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him.' In this passage not only the



constancy and perpetuity, but the power and efficacy of our Lord's intercession are asserted. They must come unto God; they must come *by* him; and then he is able to save them completely."—p. 342.

"He who has not felt the weakness of his nature, it is probable, has reflected little upon the subject of religion:—I should conjecture this to be the case."—p. 410.

"It is a change of heart which is attributable to the Spirit of God, and this may be sudden. The fruits, the corresponding effects, the external reformation and external good actions will follow in due time. 'I will take the stony heart out of their flesh; and will give them an heart of flesh.'—These words may well describe God's dealings with his moral creatures, and the operations of his grace: then follows a description of the effects of these dealings, of these operations, of that grace, viz. 'that they may walk in my statutes, and keep my ordinances and do them,' which represents a permanent habit and course of life 'resulting from an inward change.'—p. 375, 376.

"A sense of spiritual weakness and of spiritual wants, a belief that divine aid and help are to be had, are principles which carry the soul to God; make us think of him, and think of him in earnest; convert, in a word, morality into religion; bring us round to holiness of life, by the road of piety and devotion; render us humble in ourselves, and grateful towards God. There are two dispositions which compose the true christian character; humility as to ourselves, affection and gratitude as to God; and both these are natural fruits and effects of the persuasion we speak of. If it be true, in fact, that the feebleness of our nature requires the succouring influence of God's spirit in carrying on the grand business of salvation, and in every state and stage of its progress, in conversion, in regeneration, in constancy, in perseverance, in sanctification; it is of the utmost importance that this truth be declared, and understood, and

confessed, and felt; because the perception and sincere acknowledgment of it will be accompanied by a train of sentiments, by a turn of thought, by a degree and species of devotion, by humility, by prayer, by piety, by a recourse to God in our religious warfare, different from what will, or perhaps can be found, in a mind unacquainted with this doctrine, or in a mind rejecting it, or in a mind unconcerned about these things one way or other."—p. 363, 364, 365.

"Let then all pray earnestly and incessantly for God's grace and influence, assisting, if it be his good pleasure, as well our minds and understandings in searching after truth, as our hearts and affections in obeying it."—p. 233.

I am, your's, &c.

חיים

#### ON THE EDUCATION OF YOUTH.

##### No. I.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

SIR,

I DARE say most of your readers have occasionally met with a new mansion, shewy in its appearance, and commanding a fine prospect, but destitute of that first of all requisites, good water. Captivated by the beauties of a favourite spot, and anticipating a long and happy residence in the midst of their domains, the gentlemen, who build houses, sometimes forget that there are certain necessities of life, for the want of which none of its embellishments or honours can compensate. A similar disappointment, but of a more affecting nature, very frequently awaits the architects of that figurative house—a family of children. Their parents have taken the greatest pains to enable them to make a figure in the world; but they have neglected to use the proper means for furnishing their minds with certain humble items, in the catalogue of qualifications for a useful, respectable, and happy life, namely, religious principles and habits. The house is erect-

ed; but, alas, there is no water. That those who despise religion should not wish the minds of their children to be imbued with it, is natural and to be expected. And that those who, while they ostensibly acknowledge the value of religion, yet hold that the heart of man is naturally good, and that the evils which abound in the world may be ascribed to the prejudices of nurses, the reveries of enthusiasts, the craft of priests, and the tyranny of rulers; should deem religious education almost superfluous, is by no means surprising. However, Sir, such characters seldom if ever take up your publication: and therefore it would be in vain to address them in it. Those whose attention I would solicit are decent and respectable parents, who wish to entertain those views of human nature, and of the duties of man, which the holy scriptures exhibit. That such persons should venture to hope that their children will perform, in subsequent life, the duties they owe to God and their fellow creatures, when little care has been taken to prepare them for this great work, is perfectly astonishing. Do we form such absurd expectations in other things? Does any man suppose that his son will be fit for any profession, or business, without substantial and persevering instruction? Does he venture to send him out into the world as a lawyer, a surgeon, or a tradesman, without a long preparation, expressly calculated to qualify him for the line of life to which he is destined? And yet how many fathers expect their children to maintain the character of Christians, with very little appropriate education to lead them to conquer, through divine grace, their natural alienation from God, and to become new creatures under Christ their Saviour! God does not treat man in this manner, but furnishes him, in the scriptures, with the most august and persuasive teachers, and the greatest variety of instruction and exhortation, calculated to turn him from darkness to light, and to in-

duce him to crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts. But man, deaf to the divine voice which says, "go and do thou likewise," and deaf also to the call even of parental affection, not seldom suffers the early years of his offspring to pass, without any systematic and adequate plan of instruction and discipline, expressly calculated for the attainment of those great ends.

But let us view this subject a little more narrowly. Is a son intended for a learned profession? He is sent to school. The father is earnest that the master should ground him well in grammar, give him a taste for classical literature, and call forth his powers in composition. Afterwards, when the youth is removed to the university, a college and tutor are selected with anxious care to promote his intellectual improvement. An earnest solicitude is felt that he should become a sound and elegant scholar; and enquiring friends are told what progress he makes in his literary pursuits. Again, suppose that a more humble walk in life is chosen by the parent, and that his boy is to be a tradesman. With what care does he select a master who perfectly understands his business, and will be likely to make the boy thoroughly acquainted with it. And as the years of apprenticeship draw towards their close, he is solicitous that his son should be instructed in all the higher parts of the trade, that he may be in no respect deficient, when he becomes his own master, and is to establish himself in life. Let any one who allows these to be just pictures of parental care, in providing for the worldly interests of children, say whether their spiritual interests are often the object of equal solicitude. Are masters chosen with the same care for the promotion of these interests? In fixing on schools and colleges, with a view to the higher professions, and on masters and counting houses for those who are to move in a more humble line, is it a matter of *prime* consideration to select those which are known to be fa-



favourable to true religion? During education is the progress of the boy in religion watched with unremitting solicitude, and promoted by all those measures which solicitude suggests? Are pains anxiously taken to remove all the obstacles in the way? And finally is the boy himself removed (when that is possible) to a more favourable situation, if those obstacles are such as essentially to counteract his advancement in religious attainments? In most cases, I fear, even where better things might be hoped, these questions must be answered in the negative. The efforts made in favour of the religious improvement of youth are partial and unsystematic, and generally cold and languid. But even when accompanied by a considerable degree of earnestness they very seldom evince a care and thought at all proportioned to the greatness of the object. An attention to the externals of religion is enforced, and glaring sins are forbidden and punished; and perhaps also the leading principles of the Gospel are occasionally inculcated. But are the temper, the taste, and the habits narrowly watched? Is evil counteracted, not only in its commencements, but even before it appears, by guarding against dispositions and practices, which, though not wrong in themselves, are dangerous from their natural alliance with those which are so? Are the dawns of good early descried and carefully cherished? And above all is the youthful mind continually taught to raise itself to the only source of safety and strength, to be diligent in self-examination, penitence, prayer, and praise? I fear it can seldom be said that a plan of this kind is followed earnestly, assiduously, and with due allowance for casual interruptions, daily from youth to manhood? And yet earnestly, assiduously, and daily is the child taught his reading and spelling, the school-boy his grammar and classics, the academician his Euclid, Locke, and Newton, and the clerk or apprentice his master's business. Can we consult our experience on these

CHRIST. OBSERV. No. 73.

points without exclaiming; "What prudent care in human things! What negligence in divine!" The result of such negligence may easily be anticipated, and is lamentably apparent in the character and habits of our young men.

Is this negligence to be accounted for from the peculiar facility with which Christian truths are imbibed, and Christian habits formed? Is the path of true religion so easily discovered, and so inviting, that the young scarcely want a monitor to point it out and recommend it to their choice; while that of human science is thorny, and arduous, and disgusting, and never willingly chosen? Let the word of God and human experience answer. In fact, truth requires that this picture should be almost reversed. Religion is that which is beyond all things repulsive to the nature of man; while human science has many charms for him, and meets with little opposition from his native propensities. In inculcating religion we are rolling a stone up-hill, which must be watched every moment or it will soon bound down again; nor can we hope to make any progress in our work without continued and painful efforts.

To those who acknowledge the natural propensity of man to evil, and yet take so little pains to correct it in his education, I cannot refrain from addressing a few expostulations. Do you act in a similar manner with respect to any corporeal deformity to which your children may be subject? Do you not take the best medical advice, and persevere perhaps for many years, and at a great expence, and with very serious inconveniences both to yourselves and your child, in the use of such means as may be recommended to you for his recovery? And yet the evil you labour to correct probably affects only one part of his frame; or the efforts of unassisted nature may remove it: and even if he should carry it with him to his grave, it may not be fatal to his present welfare, much less to his future happiness. But the disease to which his soul is sub-

ject is universal, pervading all its faculties and dispositions. Nature instead of affording a remedy, is its source, and if not counteracted will infallibly render it more and more desperate; and the evils it threatens are of infinite magnitude, and of eternal duration. What then can you think of your negligence? Are you not most cruelly deficient in your care of your offspring? And how will you render an account to that Being who has given you a sacred charge to act as his vicegerents in their education?

The causes of those lamentable and almost universal defects in religious education which have been noticed are various. Several of them will be mentioned in future papers, which it is my intention to submit to you on the subject of education. The attention of your readers shall be called to two or three only on the present occasion.

When parents, though they may have a great respect for religion, are not truly religious, there is no difficulty in accounting for their lukewarmness in providing for the religious education of their children. If they do not consider Christianity as the pearl of great price; if in practice they make it rather the handmaid of their worldly interests and pleasures, than the unrivalled empress of their hearts, and the sovereign guide of their actions: if this is *practically* the estimation in which they hold it, of course they will give it but a second, a third, or a fourth place, among the objects on which their view is fixed in the education of their children. If, in their passage through life, they do not *in fact* (whatever they may hold in theory) sacrifice their own profit, or pleasure, or reputation, at the shrine of religion, when these cannot be secured without some dereliction of duty; it must be expected that, whatever they may profess as to their plans of education, they will *in fact* attend more to the worldly advancement, or pleasure, or reputation of their children, than to their progress in vital Christianity. As such parents, however, frequently

lament in themselves defects which they have not a heart to remedy; let them be asked whether they would willingly see their offspring in the same state of thralldom, pursuing a course which they disapprove, and breathing fruitless wishes after that holiness which they have not the courage to practise. If their minds revolt at this prospect, let them, in their choice of masters and instructors at least, endeavour to rescue their children from the evils which press upon themselves. They may think it impracticable in their own case (though in truth, if they undertook the work in a right spirit, they would conquer every difficulty by the all-powerful aid of divine grace) to break through inveterate habits, and to brave, amidst a circle of acquaintance like themselves, the looks, the language, the demeanour, to which a prompt and universal obedience to the calls of duty would expose them: But let them have pity on their offspring, and put them in a course which, with God's blessing, may preserve them from the galling fetters which bind their parents.

There are certain classes of upright Christians (and I solicit their attention with far better hope) whose efforts in the great work of Christian education are feeble, from causes of a very different kind. Two of these causes, which arise immediately out of their religious principles, I will now mention.

Some parents, of a truly Christian character, are of opinion, that although the instruction of the head is in a good measure left to man, God vindicates to himself in a peculiar manner the empire of the heart, and carries on his own work of conversion in his own way. They therefore regard human endeavours to lead the hearts of the young to God as (to say the least) of very doubtful efficacy; and perhaps look with some jealousy on a very sedulous use of means, for the attainment of this object, as indicative of a disposition to *depend* on means, rather than on the power and mercy of God. They hope that if they preserve their chil-



dren, as far as may be, from the contamination of the world, make them well acquainted with the Christian doctrine, and use them to a regular attendance on religious ordinances, He will hear the earnest prayers offered up for them, and in His good time work on their affections and bring them to Himself. These sentiments, in which there is a specious mixture of truth and error, are mixed up with others of a very different bearing, which have a powerful tendency to counteract their practical effects. By an attentive observer, however, well acquainted with the interior of the families of pious parents, their operation will not unfrequently be distinctly traced: and in whatever degree they operate, their tendency must be to weaken, if not to paralyze, parental exertions. The hearts and the habits of the rising generation will not be watched with due solicitude, and evils will not be checked and anticipated, or promising appearances cherished, with that wakeful and unremitting anxiety which the incalculable importance of education demands. Nature, with its corruptions, will be allowed to gather strength; and grace, if assisted, will be feebly assisted, by parental co-operation, (a co-operation which must itself also be altogether the fruit of grace), till the little victims of this false system contract a most pernicious and fatal habit of hearing and repeating religious truths with indifference, and sometimes perhaps are in nearly as bad a state as the offspring of irreligious parents.

How can such a case be contemplated without an unusual share of awe and of pity! Of pity for children with bright prospects so blasted; and for parents whose very piety, under partial and therefore mistaken views of Gospel truth, prepares disappointment and bitter pangs in future life, if not eternal ruin, for those whom they have brought into being, and whom, under a better system of education, they might have found their glory and joy and crown of rejoicing in the great day of the Lord.

That their views of religious truth have been partial and erroneous, who can doubt? God is, in the strictest sense, the giver of all good, both in the natural and in the spiritual world: but in both he employs means to effect his objects; and the well-directed efforts of his creatures form a most important branch of those means. Who expects to reap if he will not sow, or to read if he will not learn his alphabet? Nor is the connection between the acquisition of spiritual advantages and the use of means less intimate. Thus, though Christ is our salvation, yet the salvation of mankind is spoken of in scripture as depending on the exertions of the apostles and their followers. They are called the *light of the world*. When it is declared that they who call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved, immediately afterwards, for the special purpose, as it should seem, of pointing out the absolute necessity of employing means, the apostle proceeds to ask "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?" Rom. x. 14, 15. And, in strict conformity with this view of things, he declares himself willing in his own ministerial labours *to spend and be spent* for the benefit of others, and charges his spiritual son Timothy, in the episcopal office assigned to him, *to be instant in season* (and by a sort of hyperbole of speech arising from his deep impression of the unspeakable importance of exertion), *out of season*. So when indolent or bad teachers are mentioned, the efficacy of means is no less strongly marked. Under the Mosaic dispensation, the sins of the people are continually ascribed to the negligence or the false doctrine of the priests. Our Saviour holds similar language when speaking of the teaching of the Scribes and Pharisees, he says that "if the blind lead the blind, *both* shall fall into the ditch." And, under the

Gospel, the effect of the errors of the well-meaning but mistaken builders of "hay, straw, stubble" on the true foundation, Christ, is pointedly noticed. It is declared that such teachers shall *suffer loss*; their people not being prepared by them to abide the fiery ordeal by which every teacher's work (that is, the flock converted by him to Christianity) was to be tried. 1 Cor. iii. 11—15. So fatal would be the effect of the wrong measures taken by them in their Christian ministry! Not to multiply quotations, I will close what I have to advance on this head with pointing out some few parts of scripture respecting the very case before us, namely, the instruction of children. How earnestly does Moses charge the Israelites *to teach the law to their children, as they rise up and sit down, and come in and go out!* Could he have more strongly characterised instant, constant, unremitting instruction? Solomon is scarcely less pressing in his exhortations *to train up a child in the way in which he should go*, and he is most distinct in his promise of a blessing and success to such instruction. When the Lord appeared as an angel to Abraham, he plainly intimated that the patriarch's exertions, among his children and the rising generation in his household, would be effectual as means of securing them in the true faith. Gen. xviii. 19. And I cannot but think that children were allowed to partake of the initiating rites of circumcision and baptism, at so early an age, on the general presumption that the appointed means of conversion, if duly employed by their parents and sponsors, would secure under God's blessing that great object.

If this view of the scriptural doctrine respecting, not the importance only, but the necessity of using means zealously, diligently, unceasingly, for the attainment of spiritual ends, be just; what shall we say of those parents who excuse their want of assiduity and vigour, in taking proper measures to impress the hearts, as well as to inform the understandings of their children, on the plea that conversion is

God's work, and that the times and seasons for carrying it on are in his hand? I will not argue with them, but leave them to the admonitory voice of their own conscience. When we look forward to the advancement of religion among the rising generation, there are no promoters of that great work on whom we fix our eyes with so much hope as pious parents. How deeply then must we lament that there should be found among them such principles as I have mentioned; which, operating on parental partiality, or love of ease, or other dispositions unfavourable to watchfulness and vigour in conducting education, present us, in a spiritual sense at least, with "ashes and mourning," in families where we expected "beauty and the oil of gladness."

But the foregoing principle is most to be deplored when joined with another, also arising from a source which challenges our respect and veneration; I mean the hope entertained by some parents, remiss in the spiritual nurture of their children, that the promised blessing to the offspring of pious ancestors will be realised, sooner or later, in their conversion. On the influence of such a sentiment, when united with that which was last under consideration, I need not dwell. Every one must see that when, on the one hand, a low opinion is entertained by parents of the efficacy of human endeavours, in leading their children to true conversion; and on the other, a hope is indulged that the great Shepherd will, at some time or other, gather them to his fold; the efforts in education will be altogether destitute of watchful and persevering energy, and the worst effects may be expected. Whether, however, this latter sentiment be combined with the former or not, it is of importance sufficient to claim our serious attention. Let us then examine how far it is warranted by scripture and experience. Those who hold it, rely on the numerous passages in the word of God, in which a blessing is promised to the seed of his true servants, and more particularly on the gracious declaration in the second



commandment. These divine promises are sources of great comfort to Christian parents, strenuously exerting themselves in bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. What numbers have been supported by them, when toiling, apparently without success, in the discharge of their parental duties! But even those who are so employed may expect more than the promises were intended to convey. And if such persons, the very persons for whose benefit the promises were given, may look forward to the conversion and final salvation of their children with unwarranted confidence; what shall we say of confidence, what shall we say even of hope, in those who are ill performing the duties of parents, and who, though they will scarcely allow it, make the promises themselves the ground of their neglect?

How far a misplaced hope of this kind may have contributed to the lamentable declension, in many instances, of succeeding generations from the piety of those which preceded them, cannot be determined: but certain it is, that such declensions stain the page of history in almost every age. Look at the successors of Joshua and of the elders of his appointment; at the sons of Samuel and of Eli, of Jehoshaphat and of Josiah; at the descendants from the members of the first Christian churches, as well as of the churches reformed from popery; at the descendants from the pious ministers ejected in this country at the time of the Restoration and from their hearers: in short, search the annals of the Jewish or Christian church in almost any age, and you will be convinced that the piety of ancestors is very far indeed from being a security to their offspring.

To humble, zealous, well-directed, and persevering efforts, in the work of Christian education, God gives a signal blessing: but those who will not employ such efforts, have no ground to expect any blessing. They may rather look with awful apprehension

to the curses every where denounced in the word of God, against those who have mercies placed within their reach, but will not accept them in the appointed way.

B. T.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

You have frequently taken pains to expose, to merited reprehension, the methods devised by ingenious men, for tranquillizing the consciences of those squeamish clergymen, who continue strangely to doubt the honesty of subscribing, as true, articles of religion which they do not believe. A new solution of this difficulty has lately met my eye, to which I beg leave to call your attention. It appeared in the Monthly Magazine for August, 1806, and is entitled "A Case in Casuistry;" and as it will serve to display the miserable sophistry by which such men as Mr. Fellowes and Mr. Stone seek to palliate the palpable dishonesty of subscribing articles which they disbelieve, and reading a liturgy which they condemn as wicked and idolatrous, I propose to send it to you with a few cursory remarks. I am persuaded that to the more intelligent part of your readers, the specimen of Socinian Casuistry, which I am about to exhibit, requires no comment; but it may be read by some whom its sophistry might embarrass, and who may therefore be glad of assistance in unravelling its fallacies.

"In the annual review," (iii. 105.) observes our casuist, "the author of a Guide to Immortality (i. e. Mr. Fellowes) is indirectly called to account, for continuing in a church to many of whose doctrines his book is described as adverse. Supposing the fact correctly stated, why ought he to quit it?"—I answer; for the same reason that such men as the late Drs. Priestly and Price, or the present Messrs. Toulmin and Belsham ought not to enter it; because they cannot conscientiously subscribe, as true, articles which they believe to be false, or engage in religious ser-

vices which they regard as erroneous and even idolatrous. Our casuist, however, thinks differently. "If" he says, "at the time of subscribing the articles, and of receiving his two successive ordinations, he was a believer in the stipulated doctrines, he had clearly a right to perform or undergo these acts." Undoubtedly: but when his belief in the stipulated doctrines has ceased, he is bound to resign his ministry, as a trust the conditions of which he is no longer able to fulfil. But to proceed with the solution of this casuistical case. "If he continues to read the prescribed liturgies; if he avoids to preach forbidden tenets; if he teaches in the public temples nothing but the religion of the state; he is still obedient to the magistrate, and performs the contract for which his salary was set apart by government." But does he fulfil his contract with the Church, which, in exacting his subscription, requires not merely that he should promise not to impugn, or to teach her doctrines, but that he should declare that he cordially, *ex animo*, believes them? And supposing that there were no such subscription, yet does that man's conscience remain inviolate who lives in the daily habit of dissembling his real sentiments, and of solemnly uttering for verities, in temples consecrated to the God of truth, what he conceives to be impious and pernicious errors? "What reason" asks the casuist, "is there for his renouncing his salary? If in his official capacity of priest, he does not swerve from his original agreement, why may he not continue to avail himself of the benefice attached to that public office?" Doubtless he may, since there is nothing a man may not do who prefers his gain to his conscience, and who will lie for lucre's sake.

A parallel is then attempted to be drawn between the priest who "is employed to read aloud to a blind and ignorant multitude," a prescribed form of service, and a scholar whom a blind man hires to read to him such books as Hume's Essay on Miracles.

And as the latter may honestly both read his task and propose his objections if he have any, so may the former: "else" he adds, "the Reformers had no right to propose their change."

But to render these cases parallel, the scholar, before he is permitted to read Hume's Essays to the blind man, should be made to swear that he believes, from his heart, every word contained in that book; and that he will maintain and propagate, as much as in him lies, the principles of its infidel author.

The reference to the case of the Reformers is particularly unfortunate. How did they act when they had detected the errors of the Church of Rome? Did they temporise, as the casuist argues we ought to do, though we should even believe as little of the reformed faith as our pious forefathers did of the dogmas of popery? No: they came out at once from the idolatrous communion: they protested against its errors: they renounced its worship. And they did this, not merely at the cost of their preferments, but at the peril of their lives. They disdained a compromise between conscience and interest. To have talked to them of "reading the prescribed liturgies, of avoiding to preach forbidden tenets, and teaching in the public temples nothing but the religion of the state," in order that they might "continue to avail themselves of the benefices attached to their public office," would have awakened their indignation; and would probably have led them to adopt the language of our Lord to St. Peter, when he officiously presumed to preach to his master the same doctrine of fleshly indulgence, "Get thee behind me Satan, for thou favourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men."

Another of our casuist's arguments is thus stated.

"No one takes it amiss in a civil magistrate, in a justice of the peace, for instance, the subscribing of a petition for the repeal of a law which he continues to execute, or the writing of a pamphlet, or the calling of



a meeting against it. Exactly parallel is the duty and obligation of the religious magistrate. The priest is to continue exercising the appointed task, while it remains appointed: but surely he may complain, and loudly too, of the established service; and may write books to induce the lawgiver to innovate; and may petition the legislature for relief; and, any where but in his church, may call the people together, and exhort them to combine for an alteration in the Rubric. Where would there be in such conduct any thing inconsistent with his duty? The charge of hypocrisy is only applicable to silent acquiescence."

Here again I must remind the casuist of a small circumstance which he is very prone to forget, and which totally destroys his exact parallel between the obligations of the civil and of the religious magistrate; I mean the *ex animo* subscription of the latter. The civil magistrate is only sworn to execute the laws as he finds them. His *approbation* of them is neither desired nor required. No *assent* or *consent* to the statutes at large is exacted from him, as the condition of his holding the office of a justice of the peace. He is guilty of no inconsistency, therefore, if he dislikes, and ever so strongly expresses his dislike, of any part of those statutes. His whole obligation is discharged, if he faithfully executes them. But the clergyman's obligation embraces his *mind* and *opinions*, and for him to "complain," and "petition," and "write books to induce the lawgiver to innovate," is to act in manifest and flagrant inconsistency with his own most solemn professions and declarations. Did this desire of innovation extend, indeed, no farther than to things *unessential* and *circumstantial*, the charge of inconsistency, I am ready to admit, might not lie. I may, for example, conscientiously declare my assent to a proposition which I really believe, though I may not think it on the whole happily expressed, and might be glad to have its phraseology

altered; and even though I may think its introduction among the articles of religion unwise. In like manner I may approve of a particular rite, as in itself unobjectionable; and yet from circumstances which have arisen since our Rubric was framed, I may perceive some inconvenience in its continued use, which may render it desirable that it should be modified or done away. But in both these cases there is a real, sincere, and substantial consent, without any equivocation or falsehood. I truly embrace the doctrine, but perhaps wish it were more clearly defined. I see nothing superstitious or unscriptural in the ceremony, but would be glad to obviate some abuse to which it appears to be liable. Did such gentlemen as Mr. Fellowes and Mr. Stone look to nothing beyond this in all their "complaining" and "petitionings," the sincerest friends of the Church of England would probably feel little alarmed at their proceedings, nor be inclined to criminate their conduct. About a cornice, or a moulding, or the turn and shaping of a pillar in the building, few might be disposed to quarrel with them;—but when they plainly shew that the innovations at which they aim are not circumstantial but essential; that reform in their vocabulary is subversion; that to procure them the relief they demand, the foundations of the Church must be destroyed;—when they openly avow their disagreement not with the *wording* of some of her doctrines, but with the whole form and substance of the doctrines themselves; not with accidental abuses resulting from the Rubric, but with the very essence of her worship, as idolatrous and detestable;—then, surely, it is high time that the trumpet be blown, to call the friends of pure and primitive Christianity "to the help of the Lord; to the help of the Lord against" adversaries, too insidious and too determined, not to require to be closely watched, and firmly and vigorously resisted; adversaries the more to be dreaded, as they are fos-

tered in her own bosom, and eat of her own bread.

Whatever becomes of the *consistency* of his client, our casuist seems to think he exculpates him from the charge of hypocrisy: "the charge of hypocrisy (says he) is only applicable to silent acquiescence." And truly, it must be owned, that when "complaining, and loudly too, of the established service," when "writing books to induce the lawgiver to innovate," and when "any where but in the Church calling his people together, and exhorting them to combine for an alteration in the Rubric;" he looks as little like a hypocrite as a man can do. But when he is *in the Church*, "reading the prescribed liturgies, avoiding to preach forbidden tenets, and teaching nothing but the religion of the state," how does he look *then*? There is something in *this* conduct beyond "silent acquiescence;" and by what name then must his client be called, according to the casuist's own shewing, at least one day in seven? In truth, he is at best a mere Proteus; a hypocrite on the Sunday, a right honest man on the Monday; ministerially contemplated, a very hypocrite; individually and civilly considered, an honest, upright character, who speaks his mind, and wears no disguises. One is here forcibly reminded of the anecdote of a certain right reverend baronet, who, being reprov'd for swearing, replied, that he did not swear as bishop of —, but as Sir Jonathan —. The retort of his reprover might supply a seasonable reflection to any gentleman acting the motley part described by our casuist;—"Ah, my Lord, but should Sir Jonathan — go to the place of torment, what will become of the bishop of —?" The application is easy.

Some sign of grace, however, appears amidst all this tergiversation and unfair dealing. This camelion-like character, this hypocrite and no hypocrite, is represented as petitioning the legislature for *relief*! The burden, it seems, after all, of subscribing, reading, and preaching every

thing but what a man believes to be true, is not quite so light as not to press and gall him a little; so that, though content indeed to carry the weight, rather than not "avail himself of the benefice connected with his public office," yet, of the two, if he might have his choice, he would not be sorry to be relieved! Now I cannot help observing, that in all this outcry for *relief*, there is something very whimsical. It may fairly be asked of these complainers, who groan under the burden of our articles and liturgies, Who has put the burden upon their backs? Has any one forced them to take it up or to carry it? Was it not their own choice at first to assume the burden? Is it not competent to them at any moment to throw it off? Why then must the peace of the whole neighbourhood be disturbed with their complainings, and honest people be summoned from their own business to come and help them to effect what they can so easily effect themselves?

But in what, I would ask, consists this tyranny over conscience, of which the Church of England is accused? Conceiving it to be very desirable, for the sake of peace and good order, that men should be of one mind in an house, she has appointed a test of the religious sentiments of those who offer themselves for admission into the Christian ministry within her pale. She compels none to take this test; and she suffers those to dwell quietly by her who refuse it. Wherein then is she to be blamed? Do not even her adversaries the same? Have they not, if not their thirty-nine articles, yet their confessions of faith, or other tests answering the same end? Will they admit men to ordination among them, or to the pastoral charge in their churches, whose religious principles do not accord with their own? And should such persons at any time *change* their principles, are they not expected also to resign their office?

But it is time we return to our author, whose notions of the necessity, and even the propriety of resig-



nation, differ materially from those we have expressed.

"Some persons similarly circumstanced have indeed resigned their livings:—a display of sincerity and disinterestedness entitled to its appropriate admiration, but not to the merit of facilitating the progress of reform. While public opinion exacts heavy pecuniary sacrifices as a fine for speaking out, silence will be generally preferred. The resigners of livings, to be consistent, must maintain that the magistrate has no right to decree a public religion; for if the state establishes any religion whatsoever, there cannot but be some compromise with private judgment. It is impossible that the clergy should all exactly and entirely coincide with the system ordained by public authority, no two independent inquirers having ever been found to interpret alike every single text of Scripture."

Now the chief ground of this sophistical argument is an assumption, wholly destitute of any foundation in fact, that the "system ordained by public authority" *fixes* the interpretation "of every single text of Scripture." A general outline of the doctrines of Scripture, embracing all important points, and sufficiently ample to ensure the peace and edification of the Church, is indeed sketched out in her articles and liturgy; but scope enough is still left for the exercise of private judgment on a variety of points of inferior moment, by which the purity of the faith is not likely to be affected, nor the unity of the spirit violated. That a coincidence, and even an "exact and entire coincidence" with the established system is *not* impossible, is proved beyond controversy by the matter of fact. Those who framed the articles, it is presumed, will be admitted to have exemplified the possibility of such a coincidence. There is all the evidence of which the case admits that a great proportion of the clergy throughout the land, for many years after the settlement of the Church in the early part

of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, were also of one mind on all the subjects comprized in her public formularies. All the writings of the men of that age which have come down to us, and the general consent of history during the same period, demonstrate that such was the case. And it is equally certain that a considerable part (to speak modestly) of the existing clergy of the land so "exactly and entirely coincide" in sentiment with the received system at the present day, that, were they called upon to deliver their opinions on all the great points of Christian doctrine, they would find themselves at a loss to devise terms which would convey them more clearly and precisely, than those which are employed in the thirty-nine articles, the book of homilies, and the liturgy. To the hypothetical arguments therefore of our author, I would oppose an argument drawn from experience.

The concluding paragraph of this curious case of conscience leaves us at a loss whether the author of it should be regarded as a Deist, or merely as a Socinian. The reader will judge for himself.

"An agreement to teach in the Church the religion of the sovereign is consequently the only practicable bargain between the state and the clergy, if uniformity be made a condition. How much better would it have been never to have proposed the act of uniformity at all, but to have left the priest and the parishioners at liberty, by a separate local concert, to vary, at pleasure, their liturgies and their rites; here to replace the pompous pageantry of Catholicism; there to imitate the cheerful festivities of Paganism. Somewhere a Clarke might have instituted his Arianism; yonder a Middleton his Anti-supernaturalism; and the wise and good of every sect and sentiment, the ornaments of literature, and the instructors of their country, might all have remained within reach of appropriate recompence. It is surprizing that at the Restoration when the court was said to swarm

with philosophers; men of influence

“ Knew no such system; no such piles  
could raise  
Of natural worship, built on prayer and  
praise  
To one sole God.” DRYDEN.

“ Surely a petition for the repeal of the act of uniformity might, with entire propriety, be subscribed by any of the established clergy, and would be received with complacence by those members of the legislature who are most anxious to conciliate the affections, and to extend the liberties of the Catholics and other Dissenters.”

I leave these concluding flourishes of the casuist to speak for themselves, having already taken leave of the

argumentative part of his case. I will only state, that I do not participate in the author's surprize, that, at the Restoration, temples “ for natural worship were not built to the sole God.” The *philosophers* with whom the court then swarmed were profligates, who worshipped no God at all; and the *divines* of that day, happening to have more reverence for Christianity than has fallen to the share of the casuist and his friends, it is not easily to be conceived, that the project would ever offer itself to their thoughts of building temples for any other worship, than that which the Scriptures reveal and prescribe; or to any other God, than the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

N. G.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

ALLOW me, Mr. Editor, to call the attention of some of your correspondents to a subject of much general importance, and peculiarly interesting to parents: I mean the question how far a Christian parent ought to carry the cultivation of the understanding and talents of his daughters: whether he ought to depart, in this respect, from the prevailing practice even of many pious persons round him: and if some departure is advised, to what point it ought to be carried; and also what cautions ought to be used in order to avoid the evils arising from the very singularity of the new system. I have been often struck by the difference between those topics which interest the gentlemen, and those which occupy the conversation of the ladies. The latter indeed usually listen to the observations of the former, during the short period of their sitting together at a dinner party; but they have sometimes seemed to me to hear with indifference discussions which have exercised the utmost talents of the

most intellectual individuals in the company; and when the female detachment is withdrawn, I have occasionally been mortified to find how great an elevation was given to the conversation round the dining table, an elevation which indicated, as I fear, a corresponding depression of the topics handled in the drawing room.

Surely, Sir, the multiplication of subjects in which husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, men and women, may unite, is desirable; and the existing system of female education may be susceptible of various improvements which shall conduce to this object. They however who lead the way must be under material disadvantages. Does a parent, or does a young woman herself endeavour to burst those narrow bounds which have been prescribed in the care of female education? The name of “blue stocking” attaches to her; the imputation of vanity arises; many modest and timid friends take the alarm; low and ordinary minds are offended; the whole empire of dullness is put into commotion, and at length arrays



itself against her; and it is well if the numerous foes to the peace of the poor female adventurer do not fix upon her the character of a person who, however gifted and accomplished, is little fitted for the ordinary matrimonial duties of life, and not very likely to marry; they themselves obviously contributing, by such observations, to the accomplishment of their own prophecy. On the other hand there is a real danger lest a superiority of intellectual attainment should excite vanity; and lest the circumstance of having to tread a somewhat unbeaten path should produce a variety of errors. The world, in my opinion, is indebted to those exalted spirits who so gallantly lead the way, where there have been few footsteps before them; and if many of them should slip, and a few should absolutely fall, let us not be discouraged. Those who follow will mark their steps, and profit by their errors.

Probably I shall be thought, by many of your readers, to have spoken too disrespectfully of the intellectual character of our English ladies, in the course of the preceding observations. Permit me, therefore, in confirmation of what I have said, to trouble you with a short passage or two from the work of a modern writer, a foreigner of distinction, who is supposed to have appretiated the British character, both male and female, with considerable justness. English gentlemen are represented, in the work to which I allude, (a work which I am far from meaning generally to recommend,) as having their minds enlarged, and their talents sharpened, by means of the share which the British constitution assigns to them in the government of the country. This compliment to the men is meant, as I conceive, to be extended, not merely to members of parliament, but to their numerous electors, to the magistracy, to all, in short, (and these are a most indefinite body), who interest themselves in political concerns. This influence of liberty upon the mind is both direct

and indirect; and doubtless it operates, in some measure, upon the female character. "As there are every where in England (says this writer) professions and employments which exalt human nature, the men, in whatever place they may live, have the means of occupying themselves usefully; but the existence of the women (the remark is here made with a reference to a retired corner of the island) must be very insipid. There are some women, who, by experience or reflection, have improved their understandings. I have known a few of these betray certain looks, employ some accents and let drop some words, uttered in a whisper, which were a departure from the common custom; but the chilling breath of the surrounding society nipped these promising buds. If these women had dared to go on, acting and speaking out of the prescribed manner, they would have been suspected to be half mad, or of doubtful character."—"It is little facts and details, with minute and trifling comments upon them, which make up the whole of what is called conversation." "Births, marriages, and deaths formed the topics of our society. We sat round the tea table many hours every day after dinner. Seven respectable ladies of the country were our usual guests. One of these said to another, 'My dear, do you think the water boils enough to make the tea?' 'My dear,' replied the other, 'I think it is too soon, for the gentlemen will not be ready to come yet.' 'Do you think' said a third, 'that they will sit long at table to-day?' 'I do not know,' answered a fourth; 'I believe the general election will be in the next week, and perhaps they will stay in the dining room to talk about that.' 'No,' said the fifth, 'I rather think they are talking of the fox chase. The dinner now will soon be over.' 'I have no such hope as yet,' said the sixth, and then silence again reigned. Every quarter of an hour, a question of the utmost indifference was asked.

The *ennui* seemed continually to return; and these women might justly have been supposed unhappy, if the habit formed from infancy had not taught them to think this kind of life supportable. At last the *gentlemen* entered; but the long expected moment seemed to produce little alteration as to the women. The men continued their conversation round the fire; the ladies remained in the middle of the drawing room, making tea; and when the hour of departure arrived, they went away with their husbands, each purposing on the next day to recommence the same round of dullness." "I passed whole days in these societies. They drank tea: they played at cards: and the women grew old; always living in the same place, and always doing and saying the same things." "My dear child," adds the writer, "this country does not resemble ours. The talents which you possess will enliven you in solitude: they *may* give pleasure to your husband: but in the small towns of this island every thing that attracts attention excites envy; and you will have no chance of marrying if it is supposed that, in your taste or talents, you do not resemble others. Those who attempt to subvert the fixed customs of the place in which they live, are sure to suffer from it. In a narrow circle every thing is known, every thing is repeated; there is not much scope for emulation, but there is much for jealousy; and it is wiser to endure a little *ennui* than to be always encountering faces expressive of surprise or ill-will; who for ever ask you *why* you act as you are doing?"

I make no apology, Mr. Editor, for troubling you with this long extract. My object is to bring this topic before you, and to implore a free and full discussion of it. I wish, indeed, that advocates for each side should be heard; and moreover, that the subject should be placed on religious grounds. Pious persons appear to me to differ considerably upon it. Some of them are

fearful lest the cultivation of the understanding and the talents should, like that false philosophy which is spoken of in Scripture, corrupt the mind from the simplicity which is in Christ. I freely confess that I am not afraid of embarking too much intellect on the side of the Gospel. The question, however, which I propose, narrows itself to the point of giving a greater degree of cultivation to the understandings of women; and the ground on which it has been principally rested, has been the expediency of qualifying them for taking a larger share in the conversation of men. I could add other and stronger reasons, but I purposely reserve myself.

I will conclude by requesting that I may not be thought to judge so harshly of the general intellectual character of my country women, as the author whom I have quoted; and also by observing, that there is a delicacy and modesty in English women, which, in my opinion, elevates them far above all their neighbours on the continent.

S. P.

---

The following letter ought to have made its appearance many months ago; but was mislaid. The author, we doubt not, will excuse the delay.

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

MR. EDITOR,  
As you make free in reviewing other Reviews, you will perhaps permit a reader to return you the compliment, by reviewing one of your Reviews. In taking this liberty, I am but claiming the privilege of an Englishman; and however mean you may esteem my employment to be, I exult in the freedom and privileges of my country. Yes, Sir, I can venture to criticise any work of the greatest nobleman in the land, without a fear of the consequences: and I assure you that I often sit in my corner, after the school hours, with one of your numbers in my hands, and make very shrewd remarks upon



it, which I flatter myself would be of great service to you, if you could be present, as Penelope is. Despise not then my low situation; for though I am but mean myself, I have had scholars who have afterwards attained to high learning. With all your severe and grave looks, were you to see what fine young gentlemen sometimes call upon me, and after shaking me by the hand in a most cordial manner, remind me of some little anecdote which happened when they were first stammering out the letters of the alphabet—I say were you to see this, with all your gravity, you would be ready to smile. And yet, Sir, these were formerly my scholars, though now some of them have been at the university, and some have been employed as writers in the Lord Chancellor's office. You may suppose then, Sir, that I have much experience in my own way; and the work about which I mean to take you to task, is “the English Spelling Book,” by Mr. Lindley Murray, which you reviewed in pp. 247, 248, of your present volume (for 1806). But as I am not *skilled in the arts* of reviewing, I will tell you my principal objection to this work, all at once. Mr. Murray, instead of selecting his reading lessons from the Bible, like my old friends Dilworth and Fenning, has banished every Scriptural expression from his Spelling Book, and has supplied the place with tales about cats and dogs. This, Sir, is a very fashionable method; but a method which is likely to be attended with most serious consequences. As far as my reading will enable me to determine, it was first introduced by Mrs. Barbauld, who avowed her opinion, that the Bible was an improper book for elementary schools. She has been followed by a whole host of minor authors. Were you to look into the window of my school, on an evening, you would see almost a basket full of those books called a “Reading made easy,” which are filled with tales from one end to the other. I would say of them, as Dr. Johnson

says of Heathen Mythology: The attention naturally retires from a new tale of a *tom-cat*, or a bad boy. Mr. Murray has sanctioned the evil practice, and you inform us that his “reading lessons are very appropriate, amusing, and useful;” and that “they are free from the prevailing taint of irreligion.” Mr. Murray has been followed by Dr. Mavor, a learned clergyman. He, too, has published a Spelling Book, in which there is not one sentence selected from the Bible, as if that was the only book which ought to have no place in the minds of infants. My old friends Dilworth and Fenning, when they did not make use of the precise words of Holy Scripture, cast an air of piety over their language, which, to me, is edifying, and not displeasing to little children. Those who view religion as a gloomy forbidding thing, may conceive that merry tales are more engaging; but surely, Sir, it is possible to connect religion with a book, without making it appear unpleasant. And I cannot see why lessons may not be graduated, so as to suit the child's capacity and progress, and still preserve the appropriate language of Christianity. An example will shew you more fully what I mean.

*Dilworth.* “No man may put off the law of God. The way of God is no ill way. My joy is in God all the day. A bad man is a foe to God.”

*Mr. Murray.* “Where is puss? There she is. Do not pull her by the tail: that will hurt her. Charles does not like to be hurt: and puss does not like to be hurt. Stroke poor puss. Give her some milk. Puss likes milk.”

*Dr. Mavor.* “Look! there is our dog Tray. He hunts and takes good care of the house. He will bark, but he will not bite. Here is a fine sleek cat. She purs and frisks and wags her tail.”

In the first of these examples every child that is accustomed to say its prayers, will at once discover the resemblance between the language of its prayers and the language of its

spelling book. Mr. Murray, I am told, is one of the people vulgarly called Quakers. And though I am not so quick scented as the people mentioned by your brethren the Anti-Jacobin Reviewers, who could "wind a heresy at the distance of a league," yet I fancy that I can see marks of Mr. Murray's religious attachments, both in his spelling book and his grammar. Among that people it is not customary to teach children their prayers. But, Sir, I hope your children say their prayers, in a very regular manner. And I assure you, that in my school Penelope often makes the little ones kneel down to say their prayers, till they are quite perfect in repeating every petition. I have no quarrel with the people called Quakers. As to myself, I am very well satisfied with good old mother Church, I mean the Protestant episcopal Church of England: and I meddle not with others. But let any *truly Christian* reader peruse the examples here produced, and say which is the most fit for the mouth of a child. I am not so morose as to think that *all* familiar stories are improper for children. My objection is that these books contain nothing of the Bible, and scarce any thing of a religious nature. Early impressions are frequently lasting. When I was an infant, a simple sentence from Dilworth's spelling book, made an impression on my mind, which has often been useful. It was this: "He best can tell what is good for me, to him will I go for help." Had this been a story about Tray, the great house dog, I should have lost the benefit of the sentence. And yet Dr. Mavor speaks of Dilworth and Fenning with great contempt, and styles them "the most tasteless and ignorant workmen." In one respect their taste appears to me unexceptionable. They loved their Bible, and seemed determined to lead children to lisp out the language of it as much as possible. Will the *Christian Observer* judge this to be improper? But let us see how the learned Dr. has mended the matter.

His spelling book contains a great number of words divided into syllables. And how are they divided? Take an example. Av-a-rice, aug-ur-y, big-ot-ry, burg-lar-y, circ-ulate, cor-pul-ent, em-ul-ate, fist-ul-a, nat-ur-al. When my school is very full, Penelope helps me. She often makes the little ones laugh, by cautioning them against breaking their teeth with hard words, lest they should not be able to eat a crust, when they get home in the evening. Now I cannot help thinking that the Dr. has made his words harder than they needed to be; and to spell them in his way would be enough to break the teeth of great big children. In short, Sir, I am an advocate for improvements in the art of teaching; but they must be such improvements as manifestly appear to all men, and especially such as have no tendency to lower my esteem of the Bible. Mr. Murray's work is ingenious; but his ingenuity will not be perceived by a child, and therefore must lose some part of its effect; and by omitting to select any of his lessons from the Bible, or in the peculiar language of Christianity, his book is so much secularized, that no truly Christian parent would wish it to be brought into common use in the education of children.

ABECEDARIAN.

*For the Christian Observer.*

EPITAPH IN INDIA. SACRED TO THE MEMORY OF A LADY WHO DIED AT SEA, ON HER RETURN FROM INDIA TO ENGLAND.

"IN the season of youth, and amidst the allurements of Eastern wealth and luxury, she studied to practise every christian virtue: But her chief praise was piety towards God. Before her health appeared to decline, she had learned to draw near to God in prayer, and to meditate on his holy word. And when her affliction came, these pious exercises became her chief delight.—She considered that her heavenly Father had permitted the visitation



of illness, and the pain of long absences from her family, that her soul might be early weaned from the world, and matured for that heavenly state to which she was soon to be called. In her many voyages (rendered necessary by her consumptive malady) she spent much of her time alone, or amongst strangers; but "*Religious Hope*" she said, "consecrated every place." She passed the Equinoctial line of this terrestrial globe seven times, before she was permitted to ascend to her heavenly rest. When she perceived that her dissolution was drawing near, she evinced great satisfaction at the divine will; but remembered with painful solicitude her infant children.—In her last hour, she besought the Lord earnestly for her two little daughters, that they might be brought up in his fear and admonition, and be early taught to "seek the narrow way, which leadeth unto life." And these, her words, are here recorded, that her children and others may read her testimony, and study to imitate her bright example. She died in the 25th year of her age.

The fame of conquerors, philosophers, and statesmen, lives for a time in what the world calls "the annals of glory," but the life of the humble person above mentioned, is *true* glory, and her fame will be eternal. A whole nation will sometimes ignorantly worship the memory of a man, who has lived a splendid life without God, and terminated a brilliant career without repentance. But the recording angels at God's right hand will inscribe in the book of life the fame and glory of that spirit, who hath had *Courage* to condemn the opinion of the world when it opposes the law of God; to be singular in that which is good; and to forgive men their trespasses:—who hath had *Wisdom* to ask, "what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" and to understand that the few years of existence here, are but the *commencement* of our being, and a short term of probation for honour, glory, and immortality:—who hath had

*Humility*; willing to be unknown, and of no reputation amongst men, so that she might be great in the sight of the Lord:—who hath had *Piety*; lifting up her voice in daily praise and prayer to the great author of her being, and accounting *His* a rational and pleasing service:—who hath had *Good Works*; practising not only those popular virtues, called generous and charitable, which even bad men may perform; but exercising herself in those self-denying duties, which Christ hath taught; "if any man will be my disciple, let him *deny* himself, and daily take up his cross and follow me:"—who hath had *Faith*, "the evidence of things not seen;" looking forward during the season of health and prosperity, to a mansion in the skies, and believing the record which God hath given of his Son, that through his atoning blood there is remission of sins; and when it appeared to be the will of God that she should die, "desiring to depart, as being far better."

When conquerors, philosophers, and statesmen, shall perform deeds like these, and exhibit a like exercise of right reason, let their names be enrolled in the annals of glory. Her name needs not to be recorded here. She sought not a name amongst men. "Her record is on high."

ORIENTALIS.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

I HAVE been highly gratified with the account of Dr. Buchanan's Researches in Travancore, and particularly with that part of it which speaks of the Jewish colonies there, and in other parts of the East. For though the Bible tells us that Shalmanezzer carried the Ten Tribes into Assyria, 2 Kings, xviii. 11, it does not give us any part of their subsequent history. One thing is certain, that they never returned to their native land: their conqueror peopled that with others. As, however, their customs would mark them as a separate people, we might expect to

find some traces of them in the countries of the East, and we may hope that we have now a prospect of having our curiosity highly gratified.

As it may be a considerable time before we are favoured with a full account of Dr. Buchanan's inquiries, many of your readers may not be displeased to have an opportunity of perusing the following extract from Mr. Maurice's *Indian Antiquities*, Vol. II. p. 323, 324, from which it appears, that the existence of the colony of Jews, in Travancore, is not a new discovery, though it was formerly received by the learned with some degree of hesitation, and was evidently of such a nature as to render a much fuller investigation highly desirable.

"A very interesting, and, if true," says Mr. Maurice, "a very important piece of historical information, is related in the *Account of the East Indies*, by Mr. Hamilton, since it appears to account for a very large portion of those ten dispersed tribes, whose place of residence, ever since the period of their captivity, has so long been the object of curious investigation among the learned. A colony of Jews, to the amount of no less than eighty thousand families, is asserted by that author, on the authority of the Dutch records at Cranganore, on the coast of Malabar, to have anciently flourished, in the kingdom of Cochin, under judges and elders of their own election. Their traditional history, which they anxiously preserve on copper-plates, deeply engraved in Hebrew characters, deposited in the sanctuary of the synagogue, relates, that their ancestors came thither before the downfall of the Babylonish empire; and that history descends, in a regular series of events, from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar to the present time. It announces them to be of the tribe of Manasses, and describes their tedious journey of three years, from Babylon to the coast of Malabar, the various sufferings which this miserable and exiled race, amounting to twenty thousand families, endured

in their progress thither; the hospitable reception they met with from the natives; their thriving commerce; their increasing population; the period of their highest power and aggrandizement, and that of their gradual decline, down to their present number, of about four thousand families only.—A similar colony, if we may believe the Jesuits, established themselves in China."

J. F. H.

*To the Editor of the Christian Observer.*

THE main object of the following verses is to call up an action of national valour suited to the present crisis, and very different from that *spirit of boastful, and, at the same time, lazy courage*, which seems to me generally (I wish it may not be fatally) prevalent. If ability to fight consists in *thinking ourselves* able, we have nothing to fear from France, with all Europe at her heels. If railing be a good substitute for horse and foot and artillery, our military preparations are already ample.\* But I cannot help being of opinion, that words are only wind, and that true heroism never despises danger too much to prepare against it.

Possibly the little poem I send you has not a sufficiently religious turn to suit your miscellany. Should you think not, I shall cheerfully acquiesce in its rejection. At the same time, I would beg to remind you, that public-spirited exertions are now become a duty very pressing on every individual, and that to recommend them from any motives that are not unchristian, is to do a feeble, perhaps, but a good service.

Several patriotic poems and songs, of the present day, struck me as too much encouraging that indolent confidence which I have before mentioned. It was this circumstance which made me, on the present occasion, a songster.

TYRTEUS MICRUS.



## THE HERO;

## OR, EXERTION AND PERSEVERANCE.

Thicker storms around us break;  
 Albion! rise to strive alone;  
 Long the game and deep the stake;  
 All is gain'd, or all is gone.

Rouse, then, patriots, now or never!  
 Lion-hearts and eagle-eyes!  
 Rouse for once, but that for ever!  
 Toil alone can win the prize.

Lo, where Victory shews the crown,  
 On a far-off hill discern'd;  
 Lo, she points to late renown,  
 Hardly sought and slowly earn'd.

Does she ask for lazy pride,  
 Haughty boast, and threatening tone?  
 For the blood whose coward tide  
 Boils for feats of words alone?

No, she asks the soul that flies  
 Ere the voice a sound prepare;  
 Or the spirit that allies  
 Words of fire with deeds of dare.

Fitful efforts does she ask?  
 Flashing quickly, quickly gone?  
 Heats that die, ere half the task,  
 Virtue's glorious task, be done?

No! she asks the flames that glow  
 Through ten thousand blasts secure;  
 Hearts of stoutest woof, that know  
 Fame's best secret—To ENDURE.

On a rock she plants her throne,  
 Quickly scann'd by curious eyes,  
 But the hero's feet alone  
 Scale the steep and reach the prize.

Dreaming courage, short endeavour,  
 Indolence which vaunts conceal,  
 Flatt'nings of the heart that never  
 Felt the swell which heroes feel,

Valour, ere the combat, crown'd,  
 Triumphs blind, which ruin cures,  
 Hence! avoid the hero's ground;  
 Hence! he needs not aid like your's.

He, the arduous race pursuing,  
 Tracks its length with gaze serene;  
 He, the distant land-mark viewing,  
 Sternly counts the waves between.

His the vigorous vital pow'r  
 Which the waste of years survives,  
 Yet, through each succeeding hour,  
 Lives a thousand cowards' lives.

His the dangers, his the spoil;  
 Bright but dearly-purchas'd bays;  
 Wounding warfare, wasting toil,  
 Are the price the hero pays.

Rouse, then, patriots, now or never!  
 Rouse for hard but high success!  
 Rouse for once, but that for ever!  
 This the effort Heaven will bless!

## REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*Lectures on the Four Last Books of the Pentateuch, designed to shew the Divine Origin of the Jewish Religion, chiefly from Internal Evidence. In Three Parts.—I. The Authenticity and Truth of the History.—II. The Theological, Moral, and Political Principles of the Jewish Law.—III. A Review of Objections. Delivered in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, at the Lecture established by the Provost and Senior Fellows, under the Will of Mrs. Donellan.—In Two Volumes. By the Rev. RICHARD GRAVES, D. D. M. R. S. A. Senior Fellow of Trinity*  
 CHRIST. OBSERV. No. 73.

College, Dublin, and Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Richmond, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.—Cadell and Davies, London, 1807. 8vo. Vol. I. pp. xxxv. and 454; Vol. II. pp. 509.

It is the peculiar advantage of Christians, in their inquiry into the truth of the old testament, that the dispensation from the reception of which they derive their name, implies and asserts the truth of that which is recorded in the Hebrew scriptures. Every reader of the Christian records must be sensible, that Christ and his apostles, in the most direct and un-

E

reserved manner, recognize the divine authority of the old testament; and, if he be a Christian believer, he must be satisfied, upon that evidence, that the old testament is true and divine. This would be *sufficient* in defect of all other evidence. Yet it must be acknowledged, that it would be desirable to find in the Jewish records appropriate and independent evidence of their truth; and it would be universally regarded as a very serious discouragement, did the circumstances attending them in their descent to our times, whether external, or internal, afford as they might do consistently with the truth of the records, a presumption of greater or less strength against them. How the case stands with respect to these venerable documents has been frequently and ably displayed. But while any thing further is to be attained we ought not to consider our work as done; and while error is daily fortifying and adorning itself by the perversion of every discovery with which the labours of an inquisitive age are rewarded, it would be hard indeed, that truth should be denied the legitimate use of these advantages; and that, through the negligence of its advocates, they should be permitted to give all their force to the opposite side.

The work before us undertakes but a part of this copious subject. That part, however, is well chosen. The character of Moses and the Mosaic œconomy, which are displayed in the last four books of the Pentateuch, may be considered as the centre and foundation of the whole divine dispensation anterior to Christianity, as recorded. If this dispensation be true, and by necessary consequence divine, the truth and divinity of the remaining portion of the old testament follow of course; although that portion has its appropriate and additional evidence, an evidence indeed of validity sufficient to stand alone. It must, however, be admitted, that any defect of proof in the Mosaic records would proportionally detract from even the

proper evidences of the subsequent and connected records. Dr. Graves confines himself to the last four books of the Pentateuch, because, as he justly alleges, the book of Genesis is a work perfectly distinct from the remainder of the Mosaic writings, and, were it treated with the accuracy and particularity which it deserves, would by itself occupy volumes, and intrench upon a province in which the industry of others has left proportionally but few vacancies. Our author has still further and very largely contracted his plan by confining himself chiefly to the Internal Evidence by which the books in question are supported. In this we think he has done wisely. The External Evidence on the subject has been largely and well detailed: but the Internal has employed the labours of few. The work of Dr. Graves was therefore a desideratum in the biblical library, and, were it but moderately executed, ought to be received with candour and gratitude. But of that candour which implies indulgence to imperfections, it will stand in but little need, and its claim upon justice on account of the abilities of its execution is very powerful. We are aware, with the author, that Bishop Warburton has professedly assumed this very province: but whoever is acquainted with the character and writings of that distinguished prelate, must be sensible that much is left to be done on almost every subject which he has undertaken; and that the person who will take the pains to follow him in the field which has employed his sickle, may find the gleanings quite as plentiful as the harvest.

We can scarcely imagine a finer field for displaying the philosophy of evidence, and for exercising those talents which are peculiarly adapted for the discovery of it, than is supplied by the records of the old testament, and particularly by those of Moses. The internal evidence of Judaism, as exhibited in the last books of the Jewish legate, has never been represented to that extent, and



with that luminousness and symmetry of concurring proof, of which it is capable, and which it deserves. The present work therefore is not only important, but in a great measure original. The observations by which Dr. Graves justifies his own plan and condemns that of an author's confining himself exclusively or principally to the consideration and refutation of objections, are so just and weighty in themselves, and so applicable to every subject either of religion or morals, that we shall consider our readers as indebted to us for extracting a considerable part of them.

“Those who were employed in refuting the objections of any one particular antagonist, were almost inevitably led to magnify these objections beyond their relative importance, in any general consideration of the subject: The same writers also frequently were induced to employ their attention almost exclusively on such passages as seemed obscure or objectionable, and pass with less distinct notice the clear and direct arguments and proofs, which were to be derived from those parts of the sacred history which scepticism itself could scarcely venture to attack;—Thus suffering the adversary of revealed truth to lead its advocate, from the strongest to the weakest ground, and prevent him from employing those topics which would operate most powerfully on every candid and unprejudiced mind. Works constructed entirely on this plan, have sometimes a most pernicious effect on the young, the uninformed, and the wavering; they lead them to consider Revelation as consisting chiefly of obscurities, and founded chiefly on questionable facts; While on the contrary, the great truths it establishes are as clear and intelligible as they are important, and the series of proofs on which it rests, when viewed in their natural order, are so firmly connected and plainly conclusive, that if considered with attention and candour, they carry with them the fullest conviction; and when contrasted with the improbabilities which must be credited without proof, and the wild conjectures which must be admitted as certain, by those who reject all supernatural interposition in the history of religion, render it evident that *blind credulity* is much more imputable to those who *believe* the sacred history to be false, than those who admit it to be true; and that sound reason and philosophy far

from being opposed to religious faith, in reality coalesce with and support it.” Vol. I. pp. viii—x.

No intelligent advocate of the Bible pretends to affirm, that no difficulties or obscurities are to be found in it. On the contrary they feel and admit them with readiness. They are indeed, when they see the advantage which is made of them, and the plausibility which they afford to infidelity, sometimes tempted to regret this circumstance; although without it, it is evident, that the Scriptures would not present that touchstone to the dispositions of men, which best suits the general plan of the divine proceedings with the human race. Where the heart is averse from the truths of revelation, the understanding immediately takes covert under its difficulties; and a depraved mind has a natural tendency to produce and confirm a perverse judgment. Men of this description often gain an advantage in little skirmishes with the out-posts of Revelation, but they are utterly unable to grapple with the main body; and they have always had so much wisdom as not to attempt it. The difficulties of Scripture are a trial even to those who cannot be said to harbour a disposition hostile to it: nay, they are so even to its decided friends. They glide down the stream of its obvious truths, those which determine its character, stamp its importance, and constitute the great mass of its substance, with rapidity and a degree of listlessness; while its difficulties, by their very nature, arrest their progress, and make a demand of such a portion of their attention, both with respect to intensity and duration, as materially to diminish the relative influence of what is plain, and to magnify, with equal injustice, their own influence. It cannot indeed be said of such persons, that they know the religion of the Bible only in its difficulties: but the bearing of this observation upon them has too much foundation not to deserve their serious consideration.

After such reflections, and more

especially after reading the paragraph which has been quoted from the author before us, we felt some surprise, notwithstanding the author's apology for it, that he should make and entitle the third part of his work, consisting only of three, and that much the largest, occupying almost the whole of the second volume, a "*Review of Objections*." Many of the subjects, although affording the foundation of objections, are of a direct and positive description, containing important circumstances relative to the Mosaic dispensation, and might therefore have been thrown under one or other of the former heads. But we feel, that it is time to come to the substance of the work itself.

The first Lecture of the first Part proposes to prove, that the Jewish nation has received the Pentateuch, as containing the only authentic history of their lawgiver and his institutions, from the very æra when these institutions commenced to the present day. This has evidently been a part of the national creed backwards to the time of the return from the Babylonish captivity; and *assuming*, as must be done in the present enquiry, unless a new and very extensive field is to be entered upon, the general or substantial credibility of the whole remainder of the Jewish scriptures, Dr. Graves has, by a minute and satisfactory examination of particulars, made it evident, that the books of Moses were fully recognized, both as to their existence and their authority, back to the very time of his immediate successor, Joshua.

The authenticity and truth of the records under consideration is proved in the second Lecture, from the subject and structure of the history, so far as the facts are not miraculous. And here the *internal* part of the argument begins. The Mosaic history, it is well known, is professedly the foundation of the religious and civil institutions of the Jews. The records profess to be contemporary with the facts recorded. The laws imposed by them determine the

*temporal interests* of the persons concerned, in the most important particulars; the distribution, descent, and tenure of property. The events recorded were recent and public: they were, without including the miracles, of a very singular nature. The simplicity; the extreme particularity respecting the tabernacle and priests, the genealogies and geographical divisions; the impartiality of the history, so different from the relations of Josephus recording the same events, (although this historian is comparatively impartial) are circumstances which powerfully corroborate the conclusion impressed by the preceding. The world has never known, and we are confident never will know, a national imposture attended with similar indications of truth. It is questionable, whether, in writings of such a description and with such consequences, the very intimation, if clear and explicit, that they were contemporary with the facts recorded, would not exclude the possibility of their reception, if they were false: it is the undoubted reception of the legislative books of the Pentateuch by the whole Jewish nation, compared with their contents, and the manner in which those contents are exhibited, which renders it incredible beyond precedent, and perhaps beyond possibility, that they should not be authentic, as far as the natural events are concerned; or that they should have been forged in a subsequent age. This argument had been more concisely, but very decisively handled by Bishop Stillingfleet, *Org. Sec. Book ii, ch. i, § iv*, to the end.

The third and fourth Lectures are an attempt to apply to the books of Moses the same mode of argument which has been so ably, and with so much originality, prosecuted by the late Archdeacon Paley, with respect to St. Paul's writings. When the paucity of materials in the case before us, and the inconsiderable number of documents, coincident in their general subject, are taken into the account, we believe that no considerate judge



will deny Dr. Graves the merit of having discovered a greater number of undesigned coincidences in the books which he examines, and of having exhibited them with much greater force of evidence, than he could easily have imagined was possible. The argument is applied first to facts not miraculous, secondly to those which are. And this acute writer justly observes, after a very important admission of Lord Bolingbroke himself which he might have quoted, that the structure of the Mosaic history is such, that the events not miraculous cannot be separated from those which are so. There is an individuality in it which renders it necessary either to receive or reject it in a body. The subject of these two Lectures will not admit of being epitomised, as Dr. Paley has observed, after having in vain attempted it with respect to his own work. The argument arising from undesigned coincidences, especially if the instances are strong, that is, if the intricacies are great and the solution decisive, is very gratifying to the mind. There is much of the pleasure of a discovery in it; and we attach to it the idea of ingenuousness. Truth, instead of obtruding her decisions, appears to be detected in the effort to conceal herself. The argument is simple, disembarrassed from all others, and wherever it is found it communicates an accession of evidence. We are ready to admit, that the degree of evidence, afforded by this species of argument, may vary from a mere presumption to the highest probability, and that it never rises to demonstrative certainty; since the same ingenuity which is able to discover, trace, and display the argument when exemplified, might in the first instance have invented it, and applied it to the support of a forgery. We may perhaps, however, apply to this subject the remarkable observation of Cicero, concerning the more abstruse parts of knowledge: *Nam neque tam est acris acies in naturis hominum et ingeniis, ut res tantas quispiam, nisi*

*monstratas, possit videre: neque tanta tamen in rebus obscuritas, ut eas non penitus acri vir ingenio cernat, si modo adspexerit* \*. Indeed the coincidences, as Dr. Paley has made to appear in the writings of St. Paul, and Dr. Graves in those of Moses, are of *such a nature*, that had an impostor thought of them, which is the first improbability, and been able to interweave them with so much simplicity and apparent want of design into the rest of his fiction, which is a second and still greater; it is probable he would at once have rejected an expedient, which he might naturally expect would mislead many into the idea of inconsistency, would certainly give them some embarrassment, and in all probability defeat the object of his imposture. Certain it is, that, if he understood any thing of the powers of the human mind, as they have been ascertained by human history, he must have calculated upon waiting upwards of a thousand years, before this ingenious instrument of deception would operate to the purpose intended. In short, we are satisfied, that there is not an individual who can persuade himself to believe, that the argument which we have been considering is the effect of artifice.

The fifth Lecture proposes to prove, what had been asserted before, but is here considered at length, that the common and miraculous events of the Mosaic history are inseparable. The reasoning we consider as incontrovertible. At p. 190, Dr. Graves remarks the circumstance, that some of the miracles, we may say all, were *partly natural*. We shall shortly have to make some observations of our own on this subject.

In the sixth, or concluding Lecture of this part, the learned author applies to the miracles of the Mosaic history, the four rules, or criteria of truth, which have made the name of Leslie so illustrious. Dr. Graves has made a trifling alteration, in order

\* De Orat. l. iii, Tom. i, p. 130, col. 1, ed. Lond. 1681.

to adapt them more accurately to his purpose. The "short method with the Deists" is a most decisive defence of Revelation; and the fittest, perhaps, on account of its size and its conclusiveness, to be put into the hands of an intelligent and candid person, who *really* doubts.

In vindicating the miraculous character of the leading events recorded in the Mosaic history concerned, Dr. Graves observes, "In the plagues inflicted upon Egypt, it is true that visible agents were, in most instances, employed; and these producing effects correspondent to their natural powers." He adds, very justly, "but their introduction, their degree, and their continuance, are plainly subservient to the command of the Jewish lawgiver; and that, when it was impossible he should have any natural power to hasten, to limit, or to direct their operations." pp. 203, 204. Here is a series of miracles *partly natural*. The advancement of topographic and physical knowledge in modern times has discovered, that many of these miracles have more of nature in them than has generally been supposed. The zealous enemies of revelation have seized this circumstance with great eagerness and pleasure, as if their own cause were materially promoted, or even decisively established by it. Dr. Geddes, as the volume before us will evince, has particularly distinguished himself in this service. Those whose great quarrel, at least professedly, with the religions of Moses and Christ is, that they appeal to miracles as their credentials, seem to consider it as essential to a miracle, that it should be miracle throughout, and to regard every ingredient which nature has put into the composition, as detracting from the character to which it pretends. They would have the histories of our Saviour's life, for instance, in order to establish their claim to inspiration, to be written, not by eye-witnesses of that life, and associates of the person concerned, but a Chinese or a Hottentot, a babe or an idiot.

It would please them, (for we must at least feign the simplicity to suppose them sincere,) that the Egyptians, in the time of Moses, should never have known what blood, frogs, lice, flies, &c. &c. were before. Now we contend, that unless there were a considerable portion of what is natural in these miracles, unless the subjects of them were natural, it could not be ascertained, that the aggregate of the act or event was miraculous; it could not have been miraculous to those who witnessed them. The nature of a thing or operation must in some degree be known, in order that we may judge whether any of the phenomena attending it be agreeable or contrary to that nature. The more extended our experience, and the more accurate our knowledge of natural things, the better able are we to ascertain when they transgress their nature. And inversely, the less our acquaintance with them, the less are we adequate to determine, whether any circumstance attending them be or be not conformable to their natural powers. An entire miracle is no miracle. They are the *circumstances* which determine the miracle. Let the circumstances of the Egyptian inflictions be attended to, and it will be utterly impossible to avoid the inference; even although we should not insist, which we do, that the time of these events, and the number of infesting animals were unprecedented. It is mere dotage to attempt to explain away, or, if we may so use the term, to naturalize, the miracles under consideration, while the account of them, as it stands in Exodus, is admitted.

The second part of this work proposes to defend the religion, morality, and policy of the Mosaic law, and to deduce from its excellence, in each of these branches of its contents, a presumption of its divine origin. It is not our purpose to abridge the work before us any farther than we conceive to be conducive to the forming a just judgment of its merits. We shall therefore dismiss the first article and lecture,



by observing, that although the obviousness of what it must contain renders it unnecessary to give any account of its contents, the ability which is displayed in it will reward the perusal even of one who is far from being new to the subject. A note, pp. 258, &c. exhibits the sentiments of Hume and Gibbon on the religion of heathenism, and at the same time furnishes a memorable instance, how far the understanding may be darkened and depraved in those who do not like to retain God in their knowledge. In discussing the morality of the Mosaic law, Dr. Graves uses the term in its utmost latitude. In this lecture the contents of the decalogue are judiciously contrasted with the public allowances and injunctions of heathenism on the same subject. This is a circumstance which deserves to be noticed and insisted upon. It is not enough to select laws and sentiments, confessedly excellent, from the political institutions and writings of the heathens; the whole system must be taken together; and if it be corrupt in any part, and the more so the greater and more essential the corruption, it must be condemned. The adversaries of Christianity have always been extremely assiduous in recommending the elegance or the tolerance, or the conviviality, or the splendour of heathenism. They have even ventured to appeal to its morals; hoping, that by one or other of these qualities, estimable or agreeable, the true religion may suffer in the comparison. And although this Dagon has repeatedly fallen down on his face before the ark of the Lord, and in the fall has lost his head and limbs, his obsequious worshippers still exert themselves, with exemplary patience and gravity, to set up the stump.

At pp. 317, &c. is a long note concerning the intention of the Mosaic Ritual. It would not have attracted our attention so sensibly had we not observed in it a commendation, far too unqualified as we conceive, of Lowman's Rationale of the

Ritual of the Hebrew Worship. As critics, we, in common with our brethren, inherit so much of the spirit of departed chivalry, as to wish to set the whole world to rights on subjects of literature; and therefore we do not think it proper to pass over this occasion, not the only one which has offered, of ascertaining the merit of a book, which treats a subject intimately connected with the character of the Mosaic law, and is become very rare. We admit that there are many judicious observations in this volume: but the divisions are very badly laid out, the arrangement embarrassed, and the repetitions endless. The substance of the book is by no means restrained to the particular subject announced by the title; but freely takes the range of the whole Mosaic law, and adduces what belongs to the moral and political parts exclusively, as the effect or intention of the ritual. Although this writer frequently refers to Spencer, it is never with censure, and commonly with approbation. He seems, indeed, to be strangely insensible of the importance of determining the question, whether, in the conformity which is discoverable between many of the Hebrew ceremonies, and those of the Egyptians, the former were the borrowers: he considers it not worth a long enquiry. p. 90. He certainly saved himself a great deal of labour by this judgment. His ignorance of Witsins's *Egyptiaca*, a work which professedly and successfully combats the hypothesis of Spencer, is unaccountable, and almost inexcusable. It was a very easy matter to find a reason for those rites which oppose the rites of Egypt: and this is all, or nearly all, that Lowman has done. The scarcity of the work, therefore, need not be regretted.

From this digression we return to our author, whose next Lecture is on the Penal Code of Moses. Here we remark, that its sanctions were principally directed against idolatry, and particularly the offering of human victims. If any law could impose

taciturnity upon an infidel, the pert blasphemy of Voltaire and the flippant *insinuation* of Gibbon on this subject might be silenced by the unquestionable fact. A note, p. 359, gratifies us by the ardent aspirations which it breathes for the success of the opponents of the African slave trade, and by the pleasure which it will have given the author, in common with every real friend of humanity, to see his wishes so speedily realised. Dr. Graves remarks, that there were no capital inflictions for offences relative to property, because the Jews were not a commercial nation.

After this Lecture there is in our opinion an improper interruption, occasioned by the insertion of two Appendixes, which throw the remaining Lecture of this part into the second volume. The Appendixes might have been placed at the end of the whole work; and then the whole second part might have been contained in the first volume. They are, however, valuable wherever they are found. The first is a good solution of those passages in the books of Moses, which have been made the foundation of a doubt by Le Clerc (who afterwards retracted his opinion) and others, whether Moses was the author of them. Nothing but the magnifying power of difficulties could ever have put these passages for a moment in competition with that strong and uniform current of plain declaration or intimation, which evinces that Moses was the writer. We are sorry to find the Critical Review, even under its new managers, continuing to deserve censure, on account of the licentiousness of its theology. After a short interval, during which it manifested some indications of returning sanity, it appears to have sunk back into the same unhappy condition which we described in 1802, p. 250. The other Appendix contains a satisfactory reply to the perversions of the Mosaic miracles, by Dr. Geddes. With respect to the passage of the Red Sea, we would refer Dr. Graves to

some observations by which, we say it with due diffidence, he might have profited, in an early part of our own work. Christ. Obs. for 1802, p. 376.

The concluding Lecture of the second part, on the Political Principles of the Jewish Law, contains much ingenious and interesting remark.

We now proceed to the third part, filling nearly the whole of the second volume, and entitled "Review of Objections." To this title we have already in part stated our objections. The distinct subjects of the lectures under this division are, the treatment enjoined upon the Jews respecting the Canaanites; the idolatries of the Jews, both contemporary with and subsequent to the life of Moses, as affecting the credibility of his miracles; the sanctions of the Mosaic law; the revelation of a future state contained in that law; the influence of Judaism; and the connexion of that dispensation with the Christian. If these subjects could not properly have been embodied with the former, and positive part of the work, which we think was in a great measure practicable, they might have been discussed as additional and connected topics. But leaving our readers to judge for themselves, we proceed to examine the contents of this portion as they stand.

The case of the Canaanites occurs the first: and we are satisfied, that as far as relates to them, their crimes were a very justifiable cause of the rigorous sentence which was passed and put in execution against them. As the Jews are concerned, the case is somewhat more difficult; not as to the justice of their being made the executioners of the divine wrath, or the duty of obeying the commission: but because such an employment might be supposed to have a tendency to induce or cherish a sanguinary and vindictive disposition. Infidels seem indebted to this circumstance for an extraordinary accession of humanity and feeling, which generally seizes them with peculiar vehemence when the profession of it promises to reflect discredit on revelation. But Dr.



Graves well argues, with respect to the objection just mentioned, that the severities enjoined were not so much against the persons, as against the idolatry of the Canaanites, and that idolatry was the sole foundation of the severities. That this distinction between the person and the crime is perfectly admissible, appears with decisive evidence from the circumstance, that the Jews were commanded, in the case of guilt, to exercise the same rigour upon themselves, and did exercise it. The general character of the Jewish law, and particularly for the times of its promulgation, was humane. To this we may add, that an injunction contrary to disposition, as often confirms or increases as overcomes it: and the extermination of the Canaanites was a single act.

The frequent idolatries of the Jews in the time of Moses, Dr. Graves contends, does not imply an absolute denial or rejection of Jehovah, nor do they prove any doubt of the divine original of the Mosaic law, which on the contrary they believed and revered. It is false, therefore, which we have been told, that the Jews were indifferent spectators of the most amazing miracles. We have a curious note, pp. 144, &c. in which an estimate is made of the peaceable years of the period under the Judges, a period of much national irregularity, and they are found to be 377 out of 450. Peace affords but scanty materials for history. The object of Dr. Graves is to shew, that, during this great plurality of peaceable years, there is every reason to believe, that the law of Moses was regularly observed by the Jewish nation; for he is here endeavouring to prove, that the conduct of the Jews, subsequent to the death of Joshua, is not inconsistent with a belief in the divine original of the Mosaic law.

The third Lecture is perhaps the most important in the whole volume. The subject is the sanctions of the Mosaic law. The reader must here carefully distinguish between a sanc-

tion and a revelation. Future rewards and punishments may not be employed as a sanction, but they may be revealed. This, it is well known, is the great question which the celebrated Warburton undertook to settle. The argument of his *Magnum Opus* is, that the omission of future sanctions in the Law of Moses infers the existence of an extraordinary providence to enforce the present sanctions which he promulged, and that by this mean the divine legation of the lawgiver is demonstrated. No one is ignorant of the unjustifiable and unnecessary excess, (unnecessary to his own conclusion) to which this theologian carried some of the positions introduced into his demonstration. Not contented with denying the assertion of future rewards and punishments as a sanction, he contended, that they were not even revealed. In this assertion, however, he was far from being consistent; but made concessions in proportion as he felt himself pressed by difficulties. The supposition, likewise, which he employs so much pains to establish, that the omission here stated, is sufficient of itself to prove an extraordinary providence, is doubtless erroneous. But we think that Dr. Graves has been driven to too great a distance on the opposite side, when he stints himself to the admission, that an extraordinary providence being proved from other sources, it will satisfactorily account for the omission of future sanctions. By so guarded a sentiment as this, little indeed is hazarded. It might surely be allowed, that the neglect in the Jewish lawgiver to avail himself of a future state of retribution, in which he could not be confuted, and his committing himself upon the positive declaration of present temporal retributions, by which he knew a few days must determine his pretensions, affords, at least, some confirmation of the fact of an extraordinary providence. However, we entirely agree with this able writer, in the general statement of his sentiments on the great sub-

ject, which the enterprising and precipitate genius of Warburton almost as much obscured as elucidated; and give our cordial assent to the following propositions:—

“First, that *Moses did not sanction his Laws by the promise of future rewards and punishments*; and secondly, that the history he records, shews, not only that *he himself believed a future state of retribution*, (which Warburton admits,) but *contains such proofs of it, as must naturally suggest it to every serious and reflecting mind*, though with less clearness than the succeeding works of the Old Testament, which exhibit this great truth with a perpetually increasing lustre, till by David, Solomon, and the prophets, it was so authoritatively revealed, as to become an article of popular belief, and practical influence among the Jewish people, and thus prepare the way for the reception of the Gospel scheme.” pp. 211, 212.

It is certain, that Moses asserted an extraordinary providence, rewarding the obedient and punishing the disobedient in the present life; and if the truth of the Mosaic, and succeeding history be admitted, such a providence was actually administered. But it must carefully be observed on this subject, that this providence was gradually withdrawn in proportion as a future state was unfolded. David and Jeremiah complain of the prosperity of the wicked almost in the same terms as would be used by Christians in the present age.

Dr. Graves has devoted a whole section, the second, of this Lecture, to the consideration and vindication of that part of the Mosaic œconomy, which teaches that the sins of the fathers will be visited on the children. We confess not to have derived much satisfaction from this defence, farther than, as stating the ordinary proceedings of providence to be exactly analogous to this, and as proving, that the objection requires atheism for its support. This, indeed, is quite enough.

The next Lecture brings us to the second proposition of Dr. Graves, which asserts, that the doctrine of a future state, although it does not

form the sanction of the Mosaic law, is an article of revelation in it; and that the revelation progressively increased in lustre under the succeeding ages of the old dispensation. This proposition is substantiated by a large collection of instances: although we think, that the author has not placed the whole subject before his readers. We regret too, that he does not appear to have consulted a valuable treatise, entitled *Argumenta Immortalitatis Animorum Humanorum, et Futuri Seculi, ex Mose collecta*, which is to be found in Michaelis's *Syntagma Commentationum*, 1759. The argument from the residence of Moses in Egypt, and his being learned in all the wisdom of that nation, must be decisive with those, who, like Spencer and Warburton, assign the origin of many of the Mosaic rites to the superstitions of Egypt; since the historical testimony, upon which these writers depend, asserts as evidently, that the Egyptians held the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments. See § xv, xvi.

It is very common with writers, who would explain or justify the defective and slowly increasing information which was vouchsafed to the Jewish nation, to say, that their minds were in too rude and uncultivated a state to receive it in a more perfect degree, and that, in order to produce this recipiency, it was necessary that a long period should be employed to that purpose. Now this representation, which, if we mistake not is adopted by Dr. Graves, (Sect. ii, of this Lecture, in the beginning) appears to us, at the least, very doubtful.

The fifth Lecture answers the objected nationality of Judaism, by proving, that its tendency and effect were excursive, and that its influence was extensive, both in the Eastern and Western worlds. It is evident, from all the researches into antiquity, that the whole body of science in the world directs its radii to one centre, and that centre is the country of Palestine and its neighbourhood.



The question whether the Grecian philosophy is to be traced to this source, may be easily settled by distinguishing, agreeably to fact, between that which is traditive and that which is ratiocinative. The first was derived as stated, and contained all that was sound in the theology of the Greeks: the second was originally, and perhaps exclusively, their own, and reflects upon them, at the same time, a high and possibly equal degree both of honour and disgrace.

We regret particularly, that the next, and final Lecture, on the connection between Judaism and Christianity, should be treated in the form of an objection. It is a subject which Christians are anxious to bring forward as a positive one of great importance, and constituting much evidence in favour of the divine origin of both religions. Dr. Graves has satisfactorily shewn, first, that Judaism was *intended* to be introductory to the Christian dispensation; and secondly, that it was so *in fact*. The necessity of such an introduction as the Mosaic law supplied, Dr. Graves endeavours to evince, by pointing out the probable state of the world, if Judaism had never existed. As there would then have been no barrier to the prevailing idolatry and impiety of the world, that idolatry and impiety must have become universal; and besides that the introduction of Christianity would then have been naturally almost impossible, its evidence would have lost much of the nature and force which it acquired from the actual current of providence. The argument we think to be solid in the present instance; although we must acknowledge, that we look with a degree of suspicion upon suppositions of what would be, if some specific event had not taken place, or had happened differently from the fact. In such suppositions we are not always at liberty to assume, that all the events which we do not disturb will operate as they have done, with the addition only of filling up, in some way, the vacancy of the parti-

cular event which we annihilate. Such an invasion of the course of providence might produce, not only its own natural consequences, such consequences as a predominant, not invariable, uniformity of experience on the subject would lead us to expect, but consequences of a nature and magnitude infinitely beyond all reasonable expectation before the event. A single and the slightest, it is not possible to say how slight, alteration in the motion of the great machine might throw the whole course of subsequent providence into another direction. This is a consideration which vindicates to the great Creator the government of his own world; and often stamps the most consummate projects or anticipations of worldly policy with the character of folly.

On the subject of the connection of the Law and the Gospel, most of our readers will recollect the second volume of Mr. Faber's *Horæ Mosaicæ*; and we are happy to find Dr. Graves referring to that work with just commendation. Towards the end of this lecture are some useful observations respecting the influence of the wide dispersion of the Jews in foreign parts as facilitating the progress of the Gospel. This subject would bear an extended discussion. If our recollection does not deceive us, the best account of the dispersion of the Jewish nation is to be found in Basnage's *History of the Jews*.

The faults which we find with these volumes are principally such as arise from the form in which the subject is discussed. In sermons, although on argumentative and historical subjects, we expect a diffuseness and rhetorical complexion of style, with a recurrence of recapitulation, which weary and even confound, when they appear in print, and are read in their true character as a dialectic performance. We think it would be of considerable advantage, in all published lectures on subjects like the present, to compress the argument into the congenial form of a

treatise or dissertation. We complain further, that a system is not observed with respect to the notes: in many cases both their matter and their length entitle them to a place in the text. Who would expect an extended outline of that vast subject, the *external* evidences of the Old Testament, in a note of the preface, stinting the unfortunate text at the top to two lines for ten pages together? There is sometimes too much levity of a sarcastic kind: but this fault is perhaps confined to the notes. We would rather not find it there. And some instances of punctuation we hardly know whether to ascribe to negligence or a peculiarity in the system of the author on that subject.

After having given so many proofs as we think we have done of our impartiality, throughout the course of the present review, we trust we shall have full credit from the author and his friends for equal impartiality, when we express our final and deliberate judgment, that this work is one of the most valuable, on account both of the subject and the treatment of it, that has enriched the department of theology for a considerable time; and that its substantial merit will transmit the name of its author to as late a posterity as any of his contemporaries are likely to reach.

---

*The Causes of the Increase of Methodism and Dissension, and of the Popularity of what is called Evangelical Preaching, and the means of obviating them, considered, in a Sermon preached at the Visitation of the Rev. the Archdeacon of Leicester, June 20, 1805; and subjoined Appendixes, in which is contained the Substance of a Sermon preached at Melton Mowbray, June 5, 1806, at the Visitation of the Right Rev. Lord Bishop of Lincoln, on the Improvement and Extension of popular Education; to which is added, a Postscript, containing Remarks on*

*Mr. Whitbread's Bill, &c.* By ROBERT ACKLOM INGRAM, B.D. Rector of Segrave, Leicestershire. London. Hatchard, 1807.

WE have perused this work with considerable interest. The author states, in his preface, that he intended to have inserted the substance of these pages, under the form of Essays, in the *Orthodox Churchman's Magazine*; and that accordingly, a part of them appeared in that magazine, in November, 1806; but that, in the January following, the Editor gave him to understand, that the remainder could not be admitted in its existing state. Mr. Ingram, therefore, "unwilling to solicit a place in any publication, regarded as unfriendly to the interests of the Church, submits his thoughts, in the present form, to an impartial public."

This publication consists, first, of a preface; secondly, of a visitation sermon, lately preached before the Bishop of Lincoln; thirdly, of an appendix, divided into four parts, in which four important subjects are separately considered; fourthly, of a postscript to the second part of the appendix; fifthly, of four or five pages, denominated the conclusion; and sixthly, of a few more last words, under the general title of a postscript, being remarks on Mr. Whitbread's bill. The work might undoubtedly have been cast into a more convenient form. The topics of it, however, are so important, and the author's manner of handling them is so temperate, sensible, and serious, and in general also so discreet, that however we may differ from him as to certain points, and may hesitate as to others; and however we may suspect that we should dissent from him as to some important doctrines on which he is silent, we consider him as having rendered an essential service, both to religion and to the Church of England, by sounding *his alarm* in the mode in which he has done it.

Some of our readers possibly may recollect, that we were lately called



upon to redeem a pledge which we were supposed to have given, respecting the chief subject which this writer has discussed, namely, the means of preserving the Church from the defection caused by the increase of what are commonly called Methodistical or Evangelical Dissenters. The truth is, we had invited our friends to offer their thoughts upon it, to whom we were willing to allow considerable freedom in the debate. If, in their discussion, much diversity of sentiment should occur, we purposed to step in among the combatants, and to endeavour to compose the strife, by freely giving our best judgment upon the case. A few papers on this topic have already appeared; and the matter is now so fully brought before us by Mr. Ingram, that we shall no longer delay to execute our task. In reviewing a small tract on a similar subject, in our number for October last, we professed to reserve ourselves for an extended review of the present work. Our readers must forgive us, if, under all these circumstances, we should trouble them at more than our usual length.

Mr. Ingram begins his preface by observing, that

“The very considerable number of Methodists and Dissenters, in every part of the kingdom; their rapid increase of late years; the increasing popularity of what is called Evangelical preaching; and the diminished attachment of the mass of the people to the Established Church, but particularly to their parish churches; are subjects that cannot be regarded, in these times, with any share of indifference and unconcern. We are not” he says, “to consider them as the effects merely of an unavoidable diversity of sentiment, or of that absurdity and erroneous judgment, which must ever be expected in unenlightened minds. We are under the necessity of viewing them in connection with the political interests of the community, and with some unpleasant apprehensions, when it is recollected that the sentiments of many of the Dissenters, and of several of the Methodists also, are unfavourable to our civil, as well as ecclesiastical institutions; that religion is sometimes only a gloss, or watch-word, to poli-

tical disaffection; and that the popular doctrines have a tendency to promote those revolutionary sentiments which have been so assiduously propagated of late years. We cannot but observe, that when one species of salutary attachment, as that between a parishioner and his minister, is infringed, the violation of any other is facilitated; and must, therefore, remark with concern, that, to whatever causes it is to be attributed, the most serious part of the lower classes are very generally united to some Methodistical or Dissenting congregation.”

As this subject is more fully treated in Appendix, No. 2, we reserve our observations till we come to that part of the present work.

Mr. Ingram introduces the following note on the passage which has been quoted; on which it may be convenient to offer some remarks in this place.

“The Evangelical clergy of the Established Church, we believe, are, in general, well affected towards government; but this is at least doubtful with respect to many of their followers, who approximate to Dissenters in sentiments and manners, associate more familiarly, in private life, with some classes of Dissenters than with other members of the Established Church, and commonly add to the strength of the dissenting party in any political struggle. Their principles, it is probable, incline to democracy and revolution more than they are aware of, or than accords with their professions of attachment to government, in which, we hope, they are sincere. The Calvinistic doctrines raise the people in their own estimation on a comparison with their superiors; and how easy the transition is to political sentiments of the most licentious complexion, we have heretofore fatally experienced in this kingdom.”

It may be true, that some of the followers of the Evangelical clergy of the Church, (we use the term in the same sense with Mr. Ingram, without meaning to prejudge the question of their religious character, to which we shall come in a subsequent part of this review,) are likely, under all the circumstances of their case, to be less favourably affected to our constitution in church than the Evangelical clergy themselves; and partly for a reason which this writer has given, namely, that they associate

more familiarly than the ministers with some of the Dissenters. We, however, think very favourably of the general character of the Evangelical laity and clergy in this respect. Indeed comparatively few, as we trust, of the orthodox Dissenters, which is the larger part of them, are inimical to the Church, except so far as to give a preference to their own ministers and mode of worship. There is, as we stated in a former article, (No. for October last, p. 675.) a considerable diminution of the ancient antipathies of the Dissenters to the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and almost even an oblivion of some of the old dissenting scruples. We cannot help briefly remarking in this place, (though we anticipate a subject on which we shall hereafter speak more largely,) that perhaps the great body of our Churchmen themselves contribute to unite both the Evangelical clergy of the Church and their followers, with the dissenting body, by the distance at which they place themselves. Thus they produce that evil which is here the subject of complaint.

That the Calvinistic doctrines, "by raising the people in their own estimation, on a comparison with their superiors," encourage licentious sentiments in politics: and that these effects of them have been already experienced in this country, is a point which ought not to be cursorily considered; and we shall take the liberty of now offering some general and introductory observations on this important topic.

The leading tenet of Calvinism (we use the term in the modern and doctrinal sense) is *Predestination*; And the doctrine of *Election* naturally associates itself with it. The other tenets of Calvinism, such as *irresistible grace*, and *final perseverance*, are also deemed integral parts of the system, being thought necessary to give consistency and perfection to it. The doctrine of *reprobation* or of *preterition*, as some have termed it, seems to annex itself to that of *election*, but it is, in point of

fact, rejected, or at least avoided by many Calvinists. All the Calvinistic tenets are believed by Calvinists to have their foundation in Scripture; and the same Scripture supplies them with much other instruction, doctrinal and practical, which they imbibe together with Calvinistic points; a circumstance which we must keep carefully in our contemplation while we are endeavouring to appretiate the effects of the Calvinistic system.

The grossest injustice has, as we believe, been done both to Calvinists on the one hand, and Arminians on the other, by taking that which is distinctive in their faith into a too separate consideration. The drug, which is poisonous alone, may be rendered less noxious, possibly salubrious, by certain combinations of which it is susceptible; and it is only an ignorant or vulgar mind which pronounces on its quality, without any reference to the effect which may be produced by the mixtures that may take place. In judging, therefore, of modern Calvinism, philosophy requires (and we are now treating the subject somewhat philosophically) that we should ask what other tenets the Calvinists of the present day are accustomed to mix up with it. Now it will be generally found, as we conceive, that they believe, and believe most seriously, in a judgment to come; that they expect all men to be tried according to their works; that they affirm the necessity of good works; that they moreover inculcate the duty of "adorning" the very doctrines of Calvinism, by doing "whatsoever things are just, lovely, and of good report:" in short, that they consider all the fruits of the spirit to be the *evidence* of election, though not the *cause* of it. We say, then, that these, and indeed many other tenets of our common Christianity ought to be kept in view, while we are judging of the general character of Calvinists. Let it also be recollected that they are a religious body. By religious, we here mean zealous in religion, far more so than the generality of modern



Christians. Is it not, therefore, obvious, that even those who may be disposed to pronounce the most unfavourable opinion on the native tendency of the insulated Calvinistic points, ought nevertheless to suspect that Calvinists may be more strict and moral, as well as more sincere and devout, more exemplary in general Christian duties, and even more orthodox in many points of acknowledged importance, than not a few of those who, in this lax age, an age peculiarly uninformed as to many branches of doctrinal divinity, set themselves in array against them. Mr. Ingram thinks that Calvinism leads a man to make odious comparisons between himself and others, and to say within himself "I am one of the elect; you a mere reprobate." Doubtless there are those who give ground for this suspicion. But may not a very similar language be in the heart also of him who is not a Calvinist? "Stand by, I am holier than thou," is a very kindred, and perhaps a not less common sentiment, which nevertheless does not particularly indicate a belief in the doctrine of election. The assumption to ourselves, of a preference, on the ground of the superiority of our own virtuous exertion, seems to be still more supportable than the assumption of a preference on the score of our particular election by God.

The self-preference which Mr. Ingram refers to Calvinism, is much more likely to be assumed on grounds purely enthusiastic. "I have been enlightened by special revelations. I have been favoured with astonishing dreams." All this is highly intoxicating. There are in many Calvinists a remarkable sobriety, and a very reasoning, though metaphysical spirit. Not a few leaders of that party, like the necessarians in philosophy, with whom they are somewhat allied, endeavour to establish their system by a long train of argument; while the favourers of free-will build chiefly on the reasonableness of distrusting the seeming deductions of reason,

when they are contradicted by feeling and instinct.

Mr. Ingram observes, that the effects of the Calvinistic creed have been but too fatally experienced in this country. Let us a little enlarge our views on this subject. In the time of Cromwell, it shall be granted that predestinarian doctrines considerably prevailed. They, however, by no means predominated in the degree which the remark of Mr. Ingram would imply. Baxter, and others, who took part with the Parliament, systematically opposed them. Calvinism, (we still speak of that doctrinal Calvinism which we have described) had associated itself with Protestantism in the minds of many of the Reformers; and it was not yet worn out in the Protestant world. It is not, therefore, to Calvinism alone, or even principally, that the religious extravagancies of the days of Cromwell ought to be ascribed. Fanaticism in all its varieties had its day. We assign to high Calvinism a share of the blame; but we incline to think that the bulk of the Calvinists were less frantic than some other parties; and that if Calvinism be madness, there is usually more method in that madness, than in most kinds of religious insanity. It is true that Cromwell was himself a Calvinist; but surely there was much sanity in him. Hypocrisy seems to have been his chief fault; and the evils arising from hypocrisy are chargeable to no particular creed. William III. also was a Calvinist. Surely then, those may be men of sense, and honesty, and patriotism, who incline to the Calvinistic sentiments. The effects, however, of religious error and extravagance, have been more than once felt in the world. At one period the Anabaptists, at another, even the Moravians, neither of whom were distinguished from their contemporaries, by predestinarian views, exhibited a deplorable licentiousness of practice, a licentiousness much connected with that spiritual pride and self-preference of

which we are treating. Enthusiasm was the source to which, in this case, the evil was to be referred.

We have spoken first of high Calvinism, and secondly of enthusiasm, as tending to spiritual pride, and to the consequent introduction of political and moral evil. There is a third species of religious error and extravagance, (we are now about to touch on tender ground) from which very mischievous effects have also been experienced in the world. We mean the error and extravagance of erecting the general priesthood of a professedly Christian country, into greater objects of veneration, and ascribing to them a much higher degree of moral credit, than fairly belongs to them. We agree with Mr. Ingram, that this is far from being the generally besetting sin of the present day. But while we are considering the causes of that disgrace which has been brought upon Christianity, by its own forward and ostentatious professors, let us not forget to advert to the greatest source of corruption within the Church, which has yet been known. A clergy, claiming in virtue of a regular succession from St. Peter, an apostolical, and more than apostolical authority, demanding to be exempt from the prying examinations of the laity, inferring that they possessed sanctity of character, not from their exhibition of that sanctity, but from the reasonableness of believing that men of their cloth, and possessing their unquestionably divine commission, must be such as it became them to be, led, though undoubtedly in somewhat ancient times, to a licentiousness which might vie with that of the Anabaptists, and also to a spiritual and political tyranny, which was much more calamitous, inasmuch as it was far more durable than that of Cromwell. The errors of a Brown, or a Swedenborg, are Anti-Christian; but the spirit of Popery is the *Anti-Christ*; and although the return of this Anti-Christ, in all his strength, is not now, as we

trust, to be much apprehended in this land; still this spirit occasionally works even in a Protestant Church; and though extravagantly feared by some, is too little suspected to exist by others. We consider this spirit as at work, when, for example, we see books written, affirming that there is no want of evangelical doctrine, or of general strictness, among the present ministers of our establishment; and when we perceive sweeping and unmeasured compliments paid at visitation sermons, or on any other occasions, to the whole body of the Church, perhaps indeed, with the exception of a few "evangelical preachers," within her pale, who are erroneously represented as almost universally Calvinists; and whom we believe to have excited this reproach partly, at least, by strictness of life, and by the multitude of followers whom the superior seriousness and earnestness of their preaching have produced. We have heard that in a besieged city, it is common for parties deputed from the main guard, to go their periodical rounds, and if no negligence or danger is perceived, to proclaim the words "all is well." We fear that the agreeable sound of "all is well," may sometimes be rather too readily circulated in some of those ecclesiastical rounds of which we speak. Are there, in our Jerusalem, no sleepy centinels? Are there no officers absent from their duty without sufficient reason? Is there no ignorance, no worldliness, no negligence, no lukewarmness, in any quarter; no forgetfulness of the leading doctrines of the Gospel:—none, we mean, that is worthy of notice, and that would have attracted censure in a pure and apostolic age? Is there no unwarlike spirit among the modern "Soldiers of Jesus Christ?" The bulk of the ministers of our Church, may be unwarrantably degraded by some; but they are also most injudiciously panegyrised by others. Mr. Ingram, however, is not chargeable with having reported that "all is well." But let



us proceed to his sermon. And here with pleasure we remark, that although at the conclusion of it, in deference, as we presume, to established custom, a somewhat unmeasured compliment is paid by him to the "invincible integrity, the disinterested benevolence, and the extent of solid and liberal information of that venerable order, of which he boasts himself a member;" and although he declares himself to be "persuaded that it is only necessary to call forth their energies," yet a spirit of free enquiry pervades the discourse, and hints are given which very fairly indicate the sentiments which are still more clearly expressed in the appendix. We cannot indeed give our unqualified approbation to such a passage as the following.

"But what now, let me ask, have been the principal subjects of dissension in the Christian world? We rarely dispute about the fundamental duties of piety and morality, or those principles of religious conduct, which are most intimately connected with the general business of life. It is readily allowed by every denomination of Christians, however different their practice may often be, that we should *do no murder, should not steal, should not commit adultery, that we should be true and just in all our dealings, and keep our bodies in temperance, soberness, and chastity*. No one presumes to deny that we should love God above all things, and our neighbour as ourselves: but, in proportion as any subject is more involved in mystery and obscurity; in proportion as it is more remote from the duties of common life, or has only an inferential connection with them, which is not perceptible but by the most highly refined and improved understandings; in that proportion does it appear to have most agitated and distracted the Christian church." p. 7, 8.

These expressions, and some others in the work, as well as the remarkable silence of the writer, on almost all doctrinal points, imply, as we think, a too great disregard to doctrine in general, and excite some uneasy suspicions in our breast.

The following passage in the sermon appears to us to be just. Our readers will perceive some little discrepancy between the sentiments ex-

CHRIST. OBSERV. No. 73.

pressed in it, and the concluding compliment to which we have already adverted.

"Removed, as we too commonly are in the course of our education, at a distance from the lower orders of the community; almost with no share of appropriate professional instruction, or conformation of manners; trained rather for disputation, than a life of diffusive benevolence; we are often admitted into the ministry with no practical knowledge of that improving intercourse, and no inclination to pursue it, which, without any degradation of the clerical character, is calculated to produce the happiest effects upon the manners of the inferior classes\*. And if we have acquired no relish for the society of any but our equals, and are habitually attached only to their diversions and amusements, or to the employments of the closet; and discharge our professional duties as a task, or interruption to our ordinary pursuits and enjoyments; we are not to be surprised, if the sheep are easily seduced from a fold which is watched only with a hireling's care; and might conclude, that we have something yet to learn from the conduct of the more popular clergy." p. 12, 13.

"Our efforts will generally be most successful, when our attention is directed to the rising generation. We may from the earliest periods instil into them such elementary knowledge, as may best prepare them for a right understanding of the service of the Church. We may by degrees correct their solecisms, and enlarge their vocabulary. By frequent examinations by question and answer, we may awaken their attention to religious subjects, we may exercise their expanding powers of judgment and reflection, and may direct their thoughts into such a channel, as is most coincident with the tenour of our public addresses." p. 14.

We earnestly recommend the following passage to general notice.

"In lieu, then, of regarding the success and popularity of other preachers with an eye of jealousy; in lieu of debasing our characters by a proneness to suspect them of insincerity; or, again, contending with them in the bitterness of controversy, let

\* "See Appendix, No. III.—In consequence of our not having an education duly accommodated to our profession, we come to the ministry ignorant of our proper deportment, and find out our deficiency only, when, perhaps, it is too late to correct it, or supply what is wanting."

us rather strive to emulate them by our good works. Let us proffer them the right hand of fellowship, and readily co-operate with them in every praise-worthy undertaking. Friendly deportment may generate an approximation of sentiment and conduct, which controversy only impedes; it may repair the breaches the Church has sustained, and again unite us all in the bonds of amity and concord.

"Finally, my reverend brethren, whatever our opinions may be on some disputable points, let us all demean ourselves as men that are in earnest for the salvation of our own souls, and the souls of our fellow Christians. If we not only believe in God, and a future state of existence, but have our minds habitually impressed with an awful sense of their importance, religion will be ever the preferred topic of our conversation, and the most prominent feature in our whole deportment. A species of diffidence restrains many from discoursing freely on religious topics, and displaying an ostensible appearance of devotional fervour; but does this diffidence or reserve accord with the character of the teacher of religion, *the light* by which the world is illuminated, *the salt* to season the earth, *the candle* raised aloft, that its lustre may be universally diffused? Does this unseasonable diffidence befit that person whose office it is to *uphold him that is falling, to strengthen the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees*; to guide and direct the wandering sinner into the paths of righteousness; and to be an example to all that they be not *ashamed of Christ, and his religion, in this adulterous and sinful generation*? A distinguished purity and sedateness of manners, non-conformity to the world, renunciation of its ordinary pleasures, heavenly-mindedness, and devotional zeal, should eminently distinguish the Christian minister. We are *a city built upon a hill, that cannot be hid*: and under the circumstances of the present times, we may expect that our conduct will be scrutinized with a degree of severity that bespeaks an absence of equity, as well as candour. Let it be our concern then, that our good be not *evil spoken of*; and let us consent, with the apostle, not to *eat flesh nor to drink wine*, to deny ourselves even innocent and lawful indulgences, rather than that the Christian name should be slandered by our deportment." p. 15, 16.

Mr. Ingram recommends co-operation at the conclusion of his discourse, after the example, both of the Dissenters, and of a body of no

less than forty or fifty evangelical preachers of the Church of England, who, as he states in a note, assemble annually at Creton, in Northamptonshire, "where some leading man presides as a kind of Bishop." The term "as a kind of Bishop," seems a little invidious, for we presume that the person in question can only be chairman of the meeting. We are of opinion with Mr. Ingram, that assemblies of this kind may be extremely useful. They will indeed very naturally arise wherever there is religious zeal. They should, however, be restrained from abuse, by the means of well considered rules, and should be carefully directed to the purposes of mutual edification, and practical utility. We should wish to see them result not merely from zeal either for doctrinal opinions, or for the maintenance of the interests of a particular party in the Church; but from a general warmth of piety, disposing ministers to associate for the purpose of devising the best means of giving religious effect to their labours, and saving the souls of men.

We now advance to the Appendix to the sermon of Mr. Ingram, a part of his work which is much the most important, and to which our attention has been very seriously drawn. Appendix, No. 1, is on subscription to the Articles of the Church of England. Mr. Ingram had intimated, in his discourse, something like a wish to see a change in the articles of our national faith. "Does it not then" said he, "appear more safe to withdraw penalties, &c. and to accept of a tacit acquiescence, and peaceable demeanour, in lieu of implicit faith and unlimited obedience?" "Whenever a tacit change and improvement of sentiment have sufficiently prepared the way, there are certain seasons for attempting a more ostensible and complete reform; but those seasons should be very cautiously discriminated." In his Appendix he becomes more plain. "In noticing (he says) the causes of dissension, we must consider subscription



as one; though, indeed, the Calvinistic Dissenters and Methodists profess to adhere more rigidly to the doctrinal articles than many of the members of the established Church themselves." "In what sense" he then proceeds to ask, "are the articles to be subscribed?" He replies, "according to the sense of the imposers;" by which he appears to mean the sentiment of the present legislature. And after having observed, with perfect justice, that probably "the several members of it have various opinions, and many of them have never thought maturely on the subject, and cannot be said to have any opinion," he adds, what probably is no less true, that if the opinion of the present legislature could be taken on the point, "a considerable latitude of construction" would be deemed by them allowable. Hence he infers, that every subscriber to the articles is also entitled to be a Latitudinarian, though each, he says, "is to determine for himself as to the extent and particulars in which he can differ," from the articles. He adds, "It is only to be wished that every person did subscribe in some sense rather than in none at all; that he acted on principles he had maturely considered, and could, if required, give a rational explanation of his conduct."

There is no part of Mr. Ingram's work with which we are less pleased than we are with this. Its tendency, as we conceive, is bad. He seems to disapprove of the latitude allowed by Dr. Paley, in the case of oaths to observe local statutes; but he appears to adopt it as allowable in the matter of subscription\*, for "by a subscription (he says) something short of the obligation of an oath is

manifestly intended, otherwise an oath would have been exacted. On a principle of acquiescence, we may subscribe to a proposition, whose truth we would not affirm by an oath\*."

Let us then call the attention of our readers to that chapter of Paley, on Oaths to observe local statutes, which is here supposed to supply some explanation of the principle to be observed in the subscription of articles. "Members of Colleges," &c. says Paley, "are required to swear to the observance of their respective statutes, which observance is become, in some cases, unlawful, in others impracticable, in others useless, in others inconvenient. Unlawful directions are countermanded by the authority which made them unlawful."

We do not scruple to contradict Dr. Paley, even in this his first position. We deny, that is to say, that it can be right for a man to swear, in plain terms, to do a thing which he means not to do, on the ground that the legislature has, by some enactment, which is considered as explanatory, absolved him from the obligation to do it. We say that the intention of the legislature ought to be indicated by a change in the form of the oath which is administered; and that any indication short of this is insufficient.

"Impracticable directions," Dr. Paley adds, "are dispensed with

\* The form of subscription is this. The minister, when ordained, among other things "*acknowledgeth all and every the articles therein contained, being in number thirty-nine, besides the ratification, to be agreeable to the word of God.*" And the canon goes on to direct that, "to these articles, whosoever will subscribe, he shall, *for the avoiding of all ambiguities, subscribe in this order and form of words, setting down both his Christian and surname, viz. I, N. N. do willingly and ex animo subscribe to these articles above mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them.*" Is this a mere acquiescence? Is it not a solemn declaration rendered still more solemn by the impressive religious ceremonies which accompany ordination?

\* The words of Mr. Ingram are these: "The latitude of construction which is here defended, is no more than what is deemed requisite when the same oaths, under all the varying circumstances of society, are enacted as qualifications for certain offices, including oaths to observe local statutes."

by the necessity of the case." Our answer is nearly the same in respect to these impracticable directions. We ought not to swear that we will do that which we know at the time of swearing to be impracticable; and if the swearing were generally refused, who can doubt that the oath would be soon amended?

Dr. Paley then proceeds to say, "The only question is, how far the members of these societies may take upon themselves to judge of the *inconveniency* of any particular direction, and make that a reason for laying aside the observation of it." To what a tremendous laxity of construction (and that in the case even of oaths) does he now, by a natural progress, at length advance? What! Is a man to swear before God, that he will obey a statute, which statute directs him to do a specific thing, he intending, at the time of swearing, not to do this thing, because he judges the doing of it to be *inconvenient*? It is true that Dr. Paley says that the inconveniency must be such that the founder of the rule would himself (as far as can be presumed) have been willing to dispense with it, if he had foreseen the inconveniency; and in order to this, he tells us, 1st, that "the inconveniency must be manifest. 2. It must arise from some change in the circumstances of the institution. 3. The direction of the statute must not only be inconvenient in the general, but prejudicial to the particular end proposed by the institution." Dr. Paley then exemplifies the matter thus: "The statutes of some colleges forbid the speaking of any language but Latin within the colleges, &c. Were colleges to retain such rules, nobody now-a-days would come near them. They are laid aside therefore, *though parts of the statutes*, and as such included within the oath, not merely because they are inconvenient, but because there is sufficient reason to believe that the founders themselves would have dispensed with them as subversive of their own designs."

We see no end to prevarication, if these principles are to be generally accredited; and we must protest against the extension of them to the subject of subscription. We have often had occasion to notice Dr. Paley's doctrine of expediency, the dangerous tendency of which is manifested in no part of his work on moral philosophy more clearly than in the passage now under our consideration. "It is not *expedient*" (the young student at our university begins by saying to himself) "that the oath to obey local statutes should be observed by me according to the terms in which it is expressed." "Well, then," it might be answered, "you will of course not take the oath." "No," replies the follower of the doctrine of expediency; "I nevertheless will take it, because it also is *not expedient* to decline taking it. I cannot be a member of the college unless I take it. I moreover shall be deemed to affect to be more conscientious than all the present collegians if I forbear. I indeed" he probably adds, "am young, and uninformed in questions of this description; and many older and graver men than I, whose example it also is clearly *expedient* to follow, have not scrupled to comply with this ancient ceremony. I will ask advice from them. They are persons of unquestionable integrity." Now, we understand the mode in which any supposeable scruples, among our ingenuous youth who come to college, are obviated, to be this. When the oath is administered, the student is informed that he will not be considered as having broken it, provided he shall freely submit to the penalties annexed to the violation, in case they shall be levied upon him. Thus modern ingenuity has supplied another method of excusing the non-performance of these oaths, a method which will serve equally in the case of oaths of all descriptions. Dr. Paley distinguishes between oaths legal and illegal, practicable and impracticable, useful and useless, convenient and inconvenient; and care-



fully instructs us in *what sense* there must be an *inconvenience* in the observance of those oaths which we may break. But the college practice supersedes these distinctions. Surely the very words used in taking the college oaths ought to be changed. The duty of proposing the change seems to us to devolve itself principally, or at least in the first instance, on those whose office it is to administer them; and if no other means of altering their form are adequate, let an act of parliament be obtained for the purpose.

But however lax may be the principle which appears to be laid down by Mr. Ingram on this subject, we are inclined to hope that he may have been betrayed, in some measure, by inadvertence, into a too great latitude of expression. He evidently is anxious to encourage more conscientiousness in subscribing to the present articles than he perceives to prevail. He moreover appears desirous of seeing some alteration in them, with a view of accommodating them to existing opinions. There is, therefore, a manifest uprightness in this writer in treating on the point. For that reason, it was the more necessary to point out any laxity in his principle of construction. Our opinion of the sense in which the articles ought to be believed by every subscriber, is this. It is that sense which, to the plain and common understanding of men, the words naturally convey: subject, unquestionably, to that latitude of interpretation which the terms employed will *fairly* and *honestly* admit. And we think, that in the articles themselves, there is enough to shew, that it was the intention of those who framed them to soften the rigour of certain doctrines which then prevailed, and to give to the Church a character of comprehensiveness and moderation, without departing, in the smallest degree, from what was fundamental and essential in Christianity. The liberty of interpreting the words of our articles, with a reference to the intention of the first imposers, though

it may fairly be exercised, is yet one which should be used with caution. It ought only to be allowed when the words employed are so doubtful and indefinite as to justify such a reference. It is of great importance to morality that the *plain* expressions of articles, either subscribed or sworn to, should be considered as strictly binding.

(*To be continued.*)

*Observations on the present State of the East India Company, with prefatory remarks on the alarming Intelligence lately received from Madras, as to the general disaffection prevailing amongst the Natives of every rank, from an Opinion that it is the intention of the British Government to compel them to embrace Christianity; &c. &c.* By Major SCOTT WARING. 3d Edition. London. Ridgway, 1807. pp. 154. Price 5s.

*A letter to the Rev. John Owen. A. M. in reply to "the brief strictures" on the preface to "observations, &c." to which is added a Postscript, containing remarks on a note printed in the Christian Observer for December, by Major SCOTT WARING.* Price 3s. 6d.

Now that the African slave trade has received its sentence, the question respecting the diffusion of Christianity, throughout Asia, strikes us as the most important that is in agitation on the theatre of this country. Nothing, surely, is more desirable than that this second project for the benefit of the world, this 'other hope' of philanthropy, should, like the former, attract a large share of the national regard; that it should not be abandoned to the scramble of party-interests, or sacrificed to the *ipse-dixit* of supposed local experience, but disposed of with a solemnity and a publicity, worthy of the numerous and vast considerations which it embraces. To excite the public attention to this subject, is

our ardent wish; we are not sufficiently presumptuous to call it our object; but, however circumscribed our influence, it shall be cheerfully exerted on a field, where, if the greatest may find much to achieve, even the least may find something.

Of Major Scott's pamphlets it is here our intention to give, not so much a full analysis, as a fair description. In reviewing hereafter some of the replies which they have, or shall have provoked, they will again demand our notice; but in the mean time we feel ourselves called upon, not only to make a few animadversions on their general spirit and tendency, but also to expose some of those contradictions and mis-statements in which they abound.

In his letter to Mr. Owen, this most intolerant champion of toleration, resents the severity of reprehension which his former pamphlet has incurred. Whatever, in that reprehension, has been unchristian or unjust, it is just in him to blame, although not perhaps very christian to resent. Yet, in the mouth of Major Scott, the accusation does not appear extremely decent. It is rather too much to hear complaints of arrogant treatment, intemperate language, or misconstrued motives, from one who ordinarily salutes his opponents with such terms of opprobrium as *ridiculous, bigotted, nonsense*, (and sometimes, by a most emphatic pleonasm, *unintelligible nonsense*); who has scarcely any softer titles for the unfortunate Baptist Missionaries, than those of *madmen, maniacs, mischievous madmen*, and other dialects of the same appellation; who on evidence miserably insufficient, (as we shall shew) blackens Dr. Kerr as an advocate for *foul fraud and deception of the basest kind*; who is equally complimentary to Dr. Buchanan, and, as we shall also shew, with still less reason; finally, who most shamefully misrepresents a passage in Dr. Buchanan's memoir, and then, with much decency, stigmatizes that passage as containing *dia-*

*bolical advice*. Indeed, Mr. Owen might retort on such a rebuker, and say "Non video quid in mea vita despicere possit Antonius."

It may farther be observed, that the animadversions which Major Scott has found so grating, appear to have produced some better effects than the mere excitement of his resentment. In his second pamphlet, he has manifestly abated somewhat, not merely of the *aigreur* and superciliousness of his manner, but also of the substance of his opinions. It is in effect, to a certain extent, a retreating fight which he there maintains; and he maintains it with some dexterity. This charge, or rather perhaps this encomium, we should not think of bringing forward, without a full purpose of substantiating its validity by proofs; and opportunities of adducing them will soon occur.

In the preface to 'the Observations,' we were very early struck with the author's bold avowal of the sentiment, that it is very doubtful whether Christians of the present day, are under any obligation to promote the diffusion of Christianity, even where to diffuse it is practicable. On such a sentiment some of our readers will think it superfluous to expend an attack; but we are of a different opinion. We have, to our surprise, discovered, that this doctrine is by no means confined to Major Scott; it is not uncommon. Besides this, Major Scott himself professes to fortify himself in it, by the countenance which he alleges it to have received from the late eminent Dr. Horseley. Now errors that have the sanction, real or supposed, of great names or of great numbers, will never die a natural death.

"It was in the fatal year 1793, that Mr. Wilberforce proposed two clauses in a Bill then depending for the renewal of the Company's charter. By one clause, *Free Schools* were to be instituted throughout India, and by another, Christian missionaries were to be appointed, and both for the avowed purpose of civilizing and converting the natives of India. These



propositions could not have been listened to in 1781, when it was the fixed principle of the legislature that we ought never to interfere with the religion, laws, or native customs of the people of India—a principle consonant both to justice and to policy.

“The clauses were negatived, but with a declaration from Lord Melville that the subject was *important*, and should be attended to.

“The Bishop of London supported similar clauses in the House of Lords. They were strongly opposed by the late Bishop of St. Asaph, a sound and orthodox divine, and one of the main pillars of our good *old Church of England*. He deprecated any attempt to interfere with the religion, the laws, or local customs of the people of India, which were so interwoven one with the other, that it would be impossible to separate them. As Christians, there was no obligation upon us, were it possible, which he denied, to attempt the conversion of the natives of India. Providence had placed millions of men under our government, who for ages differed from us in religion, laws, and customs, and we were bound upon every principle of justice as well as policy to preserve to them the free exercise of each. The command of our Saviour to his Apostles to preach the Gospel to all nations, did not, as he conceived, apply to us. The gift of languages, and the power of working miracles, were conferred on the Apostles. All extraordinary powers had long ceased, and the extraordinary commission, he conceived, had ceased also.

“The Bishop of St. Asaph, in this speech, delivered opinions which were *universal* in England in 1781. Since that period many very worthy and good men are of opinion, that, as Christians, it is incumbent upon us to spread the Christian religion as widely as we possibly can; and highly indeed do I applaud their zeal when it is exerted in countries where we have no political power; but I much doubt whether we can be justified in attempting to convert the people of India, were it probable even that we could succeed at any distant period of time. Convinced, however, as I am, that to succeed is *impossible*, I dread the fatal consequence that may result from the attempts which we are making so avowedly and so openly.” Obs. p. xii—xiv.

In this extract, it cost us some puzzling to discover that by “the *fatal* year 1793,” the author intends us to understand a year that *might* have been fatal. In fact the year

must have appeared to him most propitious, as it thwarted the proselyting views of Mr. Wilberforce and the Bishop of London. But with respect to the opinions of the Bishop of St. Asaph, however tenacious Major Scott professes himself to be of the praise of accuracy, we must beg leave to suspect that he has a little mis-stated them. On looking into Woodfall’s account of the debate in question, we find the following report of the Bishop’s speech:

“The Bishop of St. David’s also stated the necessity of making provision for giving to British subjects in India the opportunity of attending divine worship; though he had great doubts, indeed, as to what had been mentioned in another place, of sending missionaries to convert to Christianity the natives of Hindostan. He conceived the religion of a country to be connected with its government, and he did not think that any foreign state had a right to interfere with the government of another country, without an express commission from Heaven; the Apostles had such commission, and in evidence of it, were invested with the power of working miracles; but such power having long ceased, he doubted whether the commission of which it was the evidence, had not ceased also.”

How all this applies to India, which is no foreign country, but a part of our own, we certainly do not see; but we do see, that this is somewhat better reasoning than that, which Major Scott has quoted as the Bishop’s, while he adopts it as his own. Our present concern, however, is with the latter. Now, that the extraordinary commission, mentioned by our author, could only be coeval with the miraculous powers conferred on the Apostles, is certainly not expressed in Scripture, and the question is, whence we are to infer it? What was the command? That the great truths of the Gospel should be every where asserted. What were the miraculous powers? Accompanying proofs, that the things asserted were truths. But they were equally truths, whether the proofs accompanied them or not; and why we are, without evidence, to suppose, that

they were never to be declared, excepting when they could in this particular manner be attested, it is not very easy to conjecture. To maintain this were almost to confound the proof with the thing proved; a species of proceeding, which we could hardly forgive in Bishop Horsey, although it may be pardonable in an author, whose demonstrations are not unusually constructed on the plan of taking the thing proved for a part of the proof.

Were miracles the only possible evidences of the truth of a religion, there might be some meaning in this argument. The limits of possibility must be supposed to bound the most extensive commission; and if to preach without miracles was necessarily useless, the preacher might be expected, whenever he found himself divested of his extraordinary powers, to presume that he was enjoined silence. But the argument is applied by our author, in a case where success is admitted to be practicable without miracles. Even in that case, he would doubt our right to convert. The case too is not merely a hypothetical one; for has it not occurred in a thousand instances, that men have become Christians, without the overbearing evidences of signs and wonders? Are there no *internal* evidences, less obtrusive, no less persuasive? Do not the Scriptures allude to these internal evidences, and imply that they may prevail, unassisted by miraculous displays of delegated power? Are not the fruits of the spirit love, joy, peace, gentleness; and were not these Christian virtues enjoined as the most effective recommendations of Christian truth? Are there no "good works," which the Gentiles beholding, may "glorify God in the day of visitation?" Does not the Apostle exhort the Christian wife to win over by her conduct the unbelieving husband; that, "if any obey not the word, they also may, without the word, be won by the conversation of the wives?" Is not the conversion of unbelievers here directly

proposed as an *object*, to those who could not be supposed to possess miraculous powers?

But to rest the duty of diffusing Christianity on the command of our Saviour to his apostles, is to argue the question on grounds miserably and unwarrantably narrow. The true grounds are these, that the highest, the most sacred duty of a Christian is to do good; and that to extend the influence of the religion of Christ, is to do good on a great scale. Doubtless here, as every where, prudence and charity are supposed to guide his actions; nor is he to suppose that his object will sanctify any means whatsoever to which he might resort. But the object is not to be considered as of slight moment. What are to be the future destinies of those who have never heard the glad tidings of the Gospel, is reposed, where it may be reposed safely, in the mind of infinite mercy and wisdom. Here we are left to conjecture; but on the only part of the subject where information can be useful to us, we have it in abundance. What can be more clear from Scripture, than that the cordial reception of Christianity is an immense advantage to him who so receives it? What can be more dismal than the delineations given by the sacred writers of the pagan world? What more vivid than the images under which they describe the emancipation from the thralldom of idolatrous service? Nor are these partial or individual sketches: all are said to have "come short of the glory of God;" all to require that high renovation which is implied in the converse of this emphatic phrase. Let no man, then, who names the name of Christ, think it an office alien from his duty, (it certainly cannot be one alien from his heart,) to assist in this moral resurrection. Let no man require any other commission for this purpose than the command to love his brethren. If wretchedness is the title of the wretched to seek relief, humanity is the title of the humane to bestow it.



In the passage quoted above from Major Scott, he fairly expresses his doubts, whether, under any circumstances excepting that of a direct authority from heaven, we should be authorised to attempt the propagation of the Christian religion throughout Hindostan. These doubts, too, he represented as entering into that aggregate *opinion*, which he repeatedly declares to have been *universal* in the year 1781, that no interference whatsoever should take place in the religion of our native subjects in Hindostan. The mutiny at Vellore seems only to have added new confirmation to his sentiments on the subject. The immediate recall of every English missionary, is recommended as a measure of the last necessity; nor are we told that the necessity which dictates this strong proceeding is likely to be temporary; that, within any period which our views of present policy may reasonably comprise within their horizon, the Baptist Missionaries or any other missionaries may be permitted to resume the design of conversion in Hindostan. The proposal of these harsh measures, by our author, is indeed accompanied with occasional assertions of his belief in Christianity; but, professing such belief, no warm expressions of regret escape from him, at the hard exigency which he solemnly announces as separating the native Indian from the only revealed religion on earth, from the true light, from the hope full of immortality. He affirms that fifty millions of our fellow creatures must remain idolatrous and ignorant, in a tone not of pity for them, but of triumph and sarcasm over those who have attempted, at the hazard of every earthly comfort, to communicate to them that knowledge, which he believes, if he believes at all, to be life eternal. He gives no 'signs of passion to behold' these millions, who are, figuratively at least, 'amerc'd of heav'n.' He coolly pronounces their conversion to be utterly impracticable, and ridicules those who may think otherwise. He

CHRIST. OBSERV. No. 73.

observes with composure the barrier that divides his fellow-men from a community of faith with himself, takes its altitude, measures its thickness, and estimates its strength; but stops not to lament that it is the wall of their prison, or to breathe an ardent wish that, once over-leaping it, they may inhale a purer atmosphere,

And, after all their tribulations long,  
See golden days, fruitful of golden deeds,  
With joy and love triumphing.

His *feelings* are wound up to an agony of alarm for the British interests in Hindostan; it is only his *principle* that feels for the eternal interests of the Indians.

Now such is the general impression which, as it seems to us, must be the result of a perusal of Major Scott's former pamphlet. If this account be just, we appeal to our readers, whether to entertain some slight suspicion of the zeal, or the sincerity, of the author, in the cause of Christianity, was unreasonable or uncharitable. It is not a parenthetical profession or two, that can dispel such a suspicion. Professions cost the unbeliever nothing; rather, they are the price which he pays for a secure attention. How do we know that Hume and Gibbon were hostile to Christianity? Certainly not because they profess their hostility: and after the innumerable instances which we have witnessed of masqued infidelity, is it not natural that the attached friends of Christianity should be jealous? This seems to have been the utmost conceivable amount of Mr. Owen's offence, when speaking of our author, he said, "But Christianity must not be spared." In his second pamphlet, the author most strongly expresses his regard for his religion; and Mr. Owen will probably give him credit for it. In the second, he also seems to retract, *sub silentio*, some of the strong assertions in the former, with regard to the general question of the diffusion of Christianity.

Take, for example, the long passage already quoted, in which the

author gave us to understand, as explicitly as explicitness itself, that when parliament, in 1793, rejected the clauses for the establishment of free schools throughout India, and the appointment of Christian missionaries for the instruction of the natives, the Bishop of St. Asaph, at least, denied the existence of any obligation on us, as Christians, "to attempt the conversion of the natives of India." Now compare this with the following strong interrogatory in the letter to Mr. Owen.

"Do you conceive that Mr. Pitt and his colleagues in 1793, the East India Company who were prepared to petition against the clauses, the Bishop of St. Asaph who so strongly opposed them, and the legislature of Great Britain, disapproved the clauses, because they supposed it was *not* the duty of the British Government to encourage Christianity amongst our Eastern subjects. *If you do, you libel many illustrious characters, now no more.* The ground of opposition was, that the attempt would not merely be useless for the end proposed, but would insure the destruction of our Oriental empire. In 1793, the Legislature retained the opinion which was *universal* in 1781." Letter, p. 30, 31.

Again; in the extract we have already made from the former pamphlet, the author said of himself;

"I much doubt whether we can be justified in attempting to convert the people of India, were it probable even that we could succeed at any distant period of time." Obs. p. xiv.

But hear the altered, and, we must think, improved notions of Major Scott, on the article of duty:

"But upon Christian principles I do hold it to be our duty to encourage Christianity where success is *practicable*." Letter, p. 30.

Would it be possible for the very spirit of contradiction to oppose and gainsay itself in a more marvellous manner? From Major Scott's letter (p. 64) we may also collect that he would now have no objection to the residence of English missionaries in India, even at this moment, provided they were to be "the inoffensive characters" which missionaries were formerly. Certainly that such is

his opinion, would not be very easily collected from the preface to the Observations. The difference, however, between the two pamphlets (which, after all, we do not assert to be in the mass very considerable,) is quite as much, in their general spirit, as in any positive *dicta* that may be directly confronted. Men retract, not so much by contradicting their former assertions, as by shading them off and explaining them away. They still continue them standing, as an army decamping by night leaves its fires burning, to shew, not where it is, but where it is not.

Our author's pamphlets are desultory, and our remarks on them can scarcely avoid some participation in their desultoriness. Having, however, considered the obligation imposed on us to extend the knowledge of the Christian faith, we should be tempted to anticipate the most obvious consequences of its extension; but Major Scott has said too little on this subject, to allow of our making it prominent. Happily the little which he does say, is rather on our side of the question. Speaking of a little tract published against him, he observes, with his natural asperity,

"The Proprietor says, 'my want of candour is singularly apparent in carefully *concealing* the monstrous and bloody superstitions of the unfortunate Hindoos.' Is the gentleman insane himself; or did he think that in addressing a letter to the Proprietors of India Stock, he was writing to madmen? Does he suppose that I am a convert to Hindoo idolatry, or a retained advocate to plead the cause of the Hindoo religion in England? Their monstrous and bloody superstitions do induce us, most undoubtedly, to wish that we had influence enough over them to persuade them to embrace the true religion, &c." Letter, p. 37, 38.

After so much cant as we have heard, and on the vaunted authority of local information, about the mild and genial influence of the Hindoo religion, we are glad to receive the frank and very opposite declaration of so competent, and on this side at least, so candid a witness as Major



Scott. Yet to our surprise, he denies (p. 30.) that, in point of policy, any "good consequences as to our interests, could result to us from the conversion of the idolatrous Hindoos or the Mahomedans;" and with his accustomed sincerity, reminds Dr. Buchanan, who had been presumptuous enough to intimate a contrary sentiment, that *nonsense even from a clergyman must still be nonsense*. Now the short question here is; Would, or would not, the deliverance from a sanguinary system of superstition, from a debasing subjection to priestcraft, and from the tyranny of an *Iliad* of fantastic and grievous customs, make our Asiatic subjects better men, more industrious, more energetic, more honest, more grateful, more cheerful? If it would, the question is decided. That the government must be a gainer by such an improvement in the habits and character of its subjects, that it must be a gainer in stability, in efficiency, in economy, in resources, civil, military, commercial, and political, is now an axiom to be reasoned from, not a theorem to be proved. It is plain sense, and may defy the opposition of every individual throughout the clergy and laity of this and every other kingdom.

Possibly Major Scott might have contemplated more at large the consequences of the naturalization of Christianity in India, had he not supposed that event impracticable. To discuss its practicability with any fullness, is beyond our power; but we may at least follow our author along the very irregular line of his observations on the point, and commit to the decision of the reader whatever we cannot settle.

The idea of compulsory conversion it would be a ridiculous waste of time even to disclaim. Major Scott does not, in fact, impute to any man the deliberate formation, on a large scale, of such a design. He does, however, charge more than one person with an inclination to compulsion; and, what is worse, to foul

fraud. We have promised to expose these misrepresentations, and we cheerfully undertake the task. Let us begin with the "*diabolical advice*" of Dr. Buchanan.

"Dr. Buchanan, in rather better language, exceeds these ignorant missionaries in violence and absurdity: he first describes the population of India as bending submissively to our mild sway; he calls them a passive people; then he mentions instances of their firmness in their religion; and adds, 'a wise policy seems to demand that we should use every means of *coercing* this contemptuous spirit of our native subjects.' More diabolical advice could not have been given by the most determined despot upon earth. Such a sentiment, from an English clergyman, strikes the mind with horror." Obs. p. lxvi.

In writing the sentence in question, though nothing was farther from Dr. Buchanan's thoughts than a compulsory conversion, he seems to have been injudicious in using the word *coerce*, because he ought to have recollected that he would be read by injudicious and prejudiced persons. The word itself is used, however, innocently and properly, as we stated in a note to our review of Mr. Twining's letter\*. We have here no concern but with Major Scott's use of the passage. And now, when Major Scott, who boasts that he never misquotes Dr. Buchanan, quotes a single insulated sentence only to pervert it in a manner the most shameful, what are we to think of him? What conclusion would be formed respecting the purport of Dr. Buchanan's book, and especially of this obnoxious passage in it, by a reader of Major Scott? Would it not be, that Dr. Buchanan exhorts us to coerce the contemptuous spirit of our *Hindoo* subjects? This is not said by Major Scott; but is it not conveyed with a certainty of implication which cannot miss its aim? What then must the reader conclude, when he is in-

\* In that note there is one error which we are free to acknowledge. It is not the contemptuous spirit of the Mahometans as exercised towards the Hindoos only, but exercised generally, that Dr. Buchanan would restrain.

formed, that in this obnoxious little clause, Dr. Buchanan is speaking *exclusively of the Mahometans!* We will give him the passage.

"Is it then good policy to cherish a vindictive religion in the bosom of the empire for ever? Would it not accord with the dictates of the soundest wisdom to allow Christian schools to be established, where the children of poor Mahometans might learn another temper; the good effects of which would be felt before one generation pass away? The adult Hindoo will hardly depart from his idol; or the Mahometan from his prophet, in his old age; but their children, when left destitute, may be brought up Christians, if the British parliament please. But as matters now stand, the follower of Mahomet imagines that we consider it a point of honour to reverence his faith and to despise our own. For he every day meets with Europeans who would more readily speak with disrespect of their own religion than of his. No where is the bigotry of this intolerant faith nursed with more tenderness than in British India. While it is suffering concussion in every other part of the world, even to Mecca, its centre, (as by a concurring providence, towards its final abolition) here it is fostered in the peaceful lap of Christian liberality.

"A wise policy seems to demand that we should use every means of coercing this contemptuous spirit of our native subjects." Dr. B.'s Memoir, p. 31.

What is worse, Major Scott elsewhere (Obs. p. xxiii.) quotes a part of this context, with this introduction: "Of the Mahometan religion, Dr. Buchanan says, No where is this intolerant faith," &c. And now what is the explanation of all this? It requires no romantic stretch of charity to renounce the worst explanation of which the case may fairly admit. We do not apprehend that Major Scott has been by his prejudices seduced into an act of deliberate deception;—we believe him to be clear of that enormity;—but we apprehend that he has rashly and intemperately raved against Dr. Buchanan, without having ever seen his book. Major Scott certainly appears to us to have known Dr. Buchanan only in that garbled state in which Mr. Twining has exhibited him. Whoever will examine the

extracts which Mr. Twining has successively torn from Dr. Buchanan's book, to hang them up bleeding in his *tolerant* page, will perceive that a reader of them might easily miss the necessary connection, in Dr. Buchanan, between the censure of the Mahometan bigotry, and the suggestion of the expediency of restraining that bigotry in its more overt acts\*. Every thing, indeed, which our present author quotes from Dr. Buchanan, will be found in Mr. Twining.

But we have not done with Dr. Buchanan's system of *coercion*. The natives of India not uncommonly, in a season of distress, abandon their children, or sell them to Europeans. The Rev. Doctor advises that these unfortunate destitutes should be bred up in the principles of the Christian religion. Of course the remark must be confined to real destitutes. This expedient our author instantly arraigns, as a chapter in the system of compulsion. This is pleasant indeed! *Compulsion*, to adopt *destitute infants*, abandoned by their own relatives, their whole race, their priests, their gods; to exercise the parental rights thus devolved, thus acquired, for the happiness of the child—the most sacred of all rights, for the noblest of all purposes; to restore those to God, whom God and nature have committed to our protection! Rejoiced should we feel, to hear some of Major Scott's notions on the subject of "using force" (as he terms it) to prevent *infants* "from exercising a religion they choose!" But is it possible to conceive the education of children of any age, without some modification of force? Is the power thus acquired over miserable outcasts, by rescuing them from misery and death, any other than that which every parent possesses, and which every parent, that does not deserve to be hunted out of society as a monster, exercises too, for the benefit of his offspring? Dr. Buchanan knew, and Major Scott knows, that when these destitutes grow up, they may,

\* Twining's Letter. 3d edit. p. 22, 23.



like other adults, choose their own religion; in the mean time, the length and breadth of their grievance is, that, where they could in no case choose one for themselves, the best has been chosen for them! Yet our author coolly says, "this would be using a kind of force, because without our assistance these unfortunate objects must perish for want!" (Lett. p. 5.) We have never heard of any thing equal or second to this.

Dr. Kerr fares still worse than Dr. Buchanan; and that, on account of the following annotation to his Report respecting the Christians in Cochin and Travancore:

"I do not think the natives will come to us freely, but to learn English. This they consider as the key to fortune; and on the coast, the most strict of the Bramins will have little hesitation, as far as I can learn, in permitting their children to attend a free-school for the purpose of learning it; for they despise us too much to suppose there is any danger of overturning the principles of Braminism. But their ill-founded ridiculous principles must be shaken to the very foundation, by the communication of such liberal knowledge as a Christian can instil into the minds of youth, and fix there by means of English books; and all this without making any alarming attack directly on the religion of the Hindoos." Obs. p. xxxvii.

Major Scott's remark on this passage is as follows:

"We are, therefore, by a deception of the basest kind, to allure the children of these Bramins to our schools, that we may shake their ridiculous ill-founded principles, but still to keep up the mask of friendly regard to their temporal interests, by merely offering to teach them a language which would be the key to fortune. No disciple of Loyala ever proposed a scheme more repugnant to every principle of justice and true morality. I am confident that the British nation possesses too just a sense of honour, and is too attached to the true Christian principle of not doing evil that good may come, to sanction so foul a fraud as Dr. Kerr recommends." Ibid. p. xxxviii.

In spite of all the exertions of candour, we fear that nothing but our experience of the precipitation with which Major Scott can interpret, could prevent us from charging him, in this place, with wilful miscon-

struction. Where does Dr. Kerr insinuate that any deception is either to be intended or practised? The Hindoos will send their children to the free-school, that they may be taught the English language, and not Christianity. They will be taught the English language, and not Christianity. But the knowledge of the English language must, by introducing to them the command of English books, liberalize their minds; and what will be the consequence? That they will have been smuggled into the pale of Christendom; baptized by magic; or deeply read in the fathers? They will be Hindoos still; but Hindoos of general learning and knowledge. Dr. Kerr only presumes, that, in this stage, they will be better recipients of the truths of Christianity, and more competent judges of its evidences, than while they were ignorant. The Hindoo parents may perhaps imagine that they will only be firmer pillars of the Braminical religion. Where is the cheat? Both sides agreed on communicating knowledge to the youth, and have only effected their common object. Dr. Kerr then, having given to him knowledge, which is power, feels assured that the daylight, which has been poured on his understanding, must lead him to that religion which is not afraid of scrutiny. This is the most natural, as well as the most candid construction of the passage.

Could we believe that, according to Dr. Kerr's plan, any thing was to be taught in the free schools, to which the parents would be apt to object; that a single clandestine lesson was to be given; we should reprobate this plan, we trust, with as much sincerity and earnestness as Major Scott, though, we trust also, in a more becoming and temperate manner.

But the main battle of our author's outrageous contumely is directed against the Baptist Missionaries. They are allowed indeed that credit for honest intentions and blameless lives, which even preju-

dice dares not withhold from them; but every single offering of eulogy to their characters is wrung back with a heavy interest from their judgment or their temper; nor is their integrity ever commemorated but in company with their insanity. Of the conduct of these missionaries in a prudential view, this is not the place to enter into a detailed examination. All that we shall attempt, is to comment on the following passage, which, as it sufficiently explains its own story, the reader will perceive to be decisive of the whole question of their recall.

"I will rest the propriety of my recommendation on two passages only of the preface; and I wish every Christian statesman, and every Christian in the kingdom, to say, whether I have recommended a strong measure on weak grounds.

"The English missionaries in Bengal, nine in number, tell us that not one of them can enter a bigotted city, 'without creating an universal alarm.' Every Christian statesman knows, and every Christian in the kingdom should know, that every city, town, and village, is filled with Hindoos and Mahomedans, who are bigotted, if the word properly applies to the population of an immense empire invincibly attached to the religion of their forefathers.

"Are Englishmen, who create so universal an alarm wherever they appear, fit to remain in India? Let the question be answered by every Christian statesman and every Christian man in the kingdom. If the answer is in the affirmative, I submit to the justice of your remarks.

"A whole village rose against three native converts. The fact is mentioned by Mr. Ward, an English missionary; who, after he has mentioned it, quotes the following words, spoken by our blessed Saviour to his disciples, 'Think you I am come to send peace on the earth? I tell you, nay.'

"These words (which most evidently, considered with their context, apply to the destruction of Jerusalem, which our blessed Saviour predicted would happen before the generation then existing had passed away,) this English missionary applies to a very alarming commotion—in fact to an insurrection to the extent of all the people that were within sight or hearing. Is it proper that this English missionary should

be allowed to remain in India?—I rest the propriety of my "remedial edict" on these two passages, without going further: I appeal for judgment to every Christian statesman, and to every Christian man in England." Letter p. 79—81.

Of these two charges, as the second more immediately affects the individual character of the missionaries, and the first more directly connects with the general topics that we have yet to notice, we will, in our consideration of them, invert their order.

Mr. Ward's application of the text "Think you I am come to send peace on the earth?" is, more than once or twice, cited in these pamphlets. In one place it is designated as an "abominable and impious perversion of that Gospel which inculcated the mild doctrine of *peace on earth and good will amongst all men.*" Elsewhere similar language is employed. This charge against Mr. Ward, we must lament our utter inability to refute, on account of the profound ignorance, in which we shall labour to our last hour, of its scope and meaning. Why this unfortunate missionary is to be sent home, for having most correctly applied a passage of Scripture,—why he "merits public reprobation" for having employed it in a sense, which has been affixed to it, we dare pledge ourselves, by almost every commentator that has ever attempted to explain it, *except the last*; it passes our comprehension to guess. Mr. Ward, perceiving that his pacific mission had, in a particular instance, excited dissension, most innocently and most naturally, as we conceive, refers to a prediction of our blessed Saviour, that such should occasionally be the consequences of the preaching of that Gospel, which in its own nature, tends to produce peace and good-will. That his implied construction of this prediction is accurately just, may be seen at once, by a reference to any commentator of name. Take Poole on the context, "I am come to send fire on the earth, &c. (Luke xii. v. 49.) Among



other interpretations, he mentions, "Rerum perturbationem quam parit Evangelii doctrina, non sua natura, sed hominum malitia, quia idololatricam sceleraque omnia evertet, unde orientur terrores terricolarum & tumultus ac conspirationes adversus prædicatores, &c. Cum que sequuntur omnia (the text in question is the next verse but one,) ad persecutiones Verbi causa orituræ pertineant, &c." One would think this was written purposely for Major Scott. It is true that some commentators refer these words, not to "the earth," but to "the land," that is the land of Jerusalem; but this can only confine the scene of the prophecy, not alter its sense.

Were the merciless dexterity of ten thousand inquisitors condensed in one effort of scrutinizing malice, and that effort spent upon this passage of Mr. Ward's, would it be possible to extort from it even the semblance of an intimation, that this gentleman wished to excite disturbances and feuds? We know not indeed, that Mr. Scott means to make this inference: we have not the remotest idea what he means; excepting always that he fully intends the recall of Mr Ward\*.

\* The whole transaction is thus narrated by Mr. Ward, and it will furnish perhaps the best answer that can be given to Major Scott. "Oct. 25. Krishno brings word that the whole village has risen up against Brother Jaggernaut, Sabakram, Gowburdhan, and the other friends at Kreesnopore. They have proposed to Kreesno Dass, that if he will no longer go to see Jaggernaut, and the other Christians, they will forgive him; but if he does they will renounce him also. He however is resolved. The consequence is, his brother has left him to eat alone in the family. 'Think you that I am come to send peace, I tell you nay.' Bap. Ac. xvi. p. 134. It is worthy of remark, that in this sentence no less than five Hindoos are mentioned, who have been willing to forfeit all the privileges of Caste, and to incur the contempt and persecution of their friends and relatives, for the sake of Christianity. If this one fact be admitted by Major Scott, then what be-

But now for the other charge. The missionaries' remark, that native converts "might get silent and unperceived into houses, and scatter the precious seed; whereas the mere appearance of an English missionary in a bigotted city would occasion the greatest alarm." Elsewhere, Mr. Scott quotes the whole passage rather differently, and instead of "greatest alarm," writes "universal alarm." Major Scott, however, who firmly believes a missionary when he pleases, seizes hold of *universal alarm*, distinguishes it in Italics, and ever afterwards sounds it forth like the coercion of Dr. Buchanan, to alarm every body else.

Now what is the true view of this matter? Did the missionaries intend to impute to the natives any *political* alarm, any dread of compulsory conversion? Major Scott does not even pretend that they did, and he knows that to pretend it would be ridiculous. What then do they mean? Evidently nothing more than the "terrores terricolarum" mentioned by Poole in the passage quoted from him above; and Poole was speaking of a case in which any approaches of his grand argument, the foundation of all the rest, the *impracticability* of converting the Hindoos?

\* "The English Missionaries in Bengal, nine in number, tell us that not one of them can enter a bigotted city without creating an universal alarm." Here we have another instance of those misrepresentations which meet us in almost every page of Major Scott's writings. The English Missionaries, nine in number, have told us no such thing. The words quoted by Major Scott, are contained in the private letter of a Mr. Marshman, (Bap. Ac. xvi. p. 170) to a friend of his in this country, without the concurrence, apparently, of any other person; and is part of an argument, not of a statement of facts. Had it been convenient for Major Scott, he might have quoted the sentiments of the nine missionaries on this very point, from an exposition, equally creditable to their piety and their prudence, of "the great principles on which they think it their duty to act in the work of instructing the heathen." Bap. Ac. No. xvi.

prehension of religious interference on the part of the government was out of the question. They were known; they were watched; their very appearance excited the jealous alarms of the superstitious. The missionaries, on many occasions, very frankly state the dislike with which they were regarded by numbers of the Hindoos, and have even been reproved by Major Scott for their arrogance, in imagining, that the Bramins dreaded the influence of their preaching on the people, and feared their success. Yet this is not unnatural; for let it be particularly remembered, that the influence of their discourses may, and doubtless does, extend to the minds of hundreds, who yet cannot muster up resolution to incur the risks of an open espousal of their cause. What has this species of alarm in common with politics?

But Major Scott may retort, that he has a right to accept the fact of the "alarm" on the evidence of the missionaries, and to put upon that fact his own interpretation, namely, that the alarm was political. If this be all, content. We have no objection to this arrangement, which has no other fault than that of leaving the question exactly where it was, by leaving it entirely open to discussion, whether Major Scott's interpretation of the fact in question be the proper and authorised interpretation. Every man is at liberty to saddle his adversary's facts with his own comments; but he is surely not at liberty to argue from his own comment as if it were a part of the adversary's fact, when the justice of that comment happens to be the very point in dispute. Major Scott may dream, if he pleases, that the Bramins mistook the missionaries for the Court of East India Directors, and Dr. Buchanan for the President of the Board of Controul; but, because it has pleased him to have this dream, would it not be rather hard to throw the missionaries into the Ganges, and Dr. Buchanan under the feet of an elephant?

From what has been, or what may yet be said, it must not be imagined that we are not strenuous advocates for caution in the prosecution of the work of conversion; or even that we would acquit the Baptist Missionaries from the charge of having committed occasional indiscretions. We do really think that Dr. Buchanan underestimates the danger of exciting the jealousy of the Hindoos, though he is infinitely nearer the truth than our present author; and nothing would we more earnestly press on the attention of every real friend to the diffusion of Christianity, than the duty of "walking wisely towards them that are without."

We must now proceed to offer a few brief remarks on the kind of evidence which has been hitherto adduced in this controversy, and they shall be ranged under three or four general heads.

In the first place, we earnestly intreat our readers to recollect, what is the principal point at issue. The ruling, indeed the only question between Major Scott and us, the question which, in a practical view, is every thing, is not, whether it be practicable to convert the native population of Hindostan; but whether the pacific means of conversion, employed by the present missionaries, are likely to excite the Hindoos to insurrection. It is not, whether the Hindoos can be converted by force; it is not even, whether they can be converted by persuasion; but it is, whether they are likely to mistake persuasion for force, and to resent it accordingly.

Major Scott is pleased to inform us, that Portugal lost her territorial dominion in India "by the excessive absurdity and bigotry of priests, who conceived, with Dr. Buchanan, that no considerations of policy should prevent them from propagating the Christian faith." Now first, this is false; for the unutterable cruelties, the infamous treacheries, the shameless rapacity, the abandoned venality; and the horrid licentious-



ness of the later Portuguese in India, were the principal causes of the downfall of their empire\*, and would, without any assistance from missionaries, have most surely effected it. Secondly, Major Scott either recollected, or should have recollected, that the only means of conversion employed by the execrable priests to whom he so politely compares Dr. Buchanan, were *fire and sword*†. How then does the instance apply?

The author is also pleased to hold up to us as a warning, the example of the Mahomedan conquerors of Hindostan, who, with the sabre in one hand, and the Koran in the other, endeavoured to convert the Hindoos, but were soon compelled to abandon their design as wild and impracticable‡. His reasoning, then, must be intended to run thus: Because the Hindoos would not be made Mahometans by force, therefore they will destroy all those who may attempt to make them Christians by persuasion: which seems to us the completest *non-sequitur* that ever had the effrontery to call itself an argument.

But even the practicability of christianizing India by mild means, is not our present concern, nor was it Major Scott's, though this topic furnished him with an opportunity, which he has by no means neglected of vilifying all the native Indians who profess to have been converted by the missionaries. The topic is indeed one which we intend, on some future occasion, amply to discuss; when we hope to produce incontro-

\* Vide Mickle's History of the Portuguese Empire in the East.

† "Yet, as if all their former cruelties had been too little, a Bull of Crusade, in 1594, arrived in India, commanding the Portuguese to reduce the infidels to the faith by the force of arms. This was a new pretence to plunder the pagodas, the repositories of the Gentoo treasures, and was procured by the Jesuits, who now governed the springs of action all over Portuguese Asia."—Ibid.

‡ But whence come our fifteen millions of Mahomedan subjects? Were none of these, or of their progenitors, originally Hindoos?

vertible proofs of the possibility of converting these victims of *invincible* prejudice\*. Indeed nothing can well be more ridiculous than to affirm, as Major Scott does, that the European missionaries in Hindostan have never made even one good convert; as if there were some physical impossibility in the case. But we decline entering on this subject, and beg to repeat that the single question before us is, whether the Hindoos will be apt to mistake persuasion on the part of a missionary for intended violence on that of the government, and to resent it accordingly.

Now we would impress it on the mind of every person interested in the discussion of this question, that the burden of proof rests entirely on them who contend for the affirmative side of it. For what is it that such persons maintain? Simply these two propositions; that the Hindoos will suspect every missionary of being a secret agent of government; and that they will suspect government of a deliberate purpose to make them Christians by force, if the preaching of the missionaries should ultimately prove ineffectual. Can a pair of propositions be conceived, on the face of them, more exquisitely absurd, or more exquisitely matched in absurdity? Is it possible to imagine a more stupid confusion of sufferance and patronage, persuasion and compulsion? That a small band of humble and unprotected preachers, on whom the meanest native may pour insults and ridicule with perfect impunity, who are regarded with contempt by many of their own countrymen, who have, in more than one instance, received the indignity of being publicly thwarted in their career by an European collector or magistrate; that these men should be regarded as the agents of the British government! That a government, which, as such, takes so little cogni-

\* With respect to the *invincible* prejudices of the Hindoos, what does Major Scott say to the numerous body of the *Seeks*, who are converts from Hinduism to their present simpler faith?



zance of religion, which suffers servants of the Company, in conspicuous stations, to live in a total and open disregard of all the known rites of Christianity, and perhaps publicly to assume the garb, and profess the faith of Hindoos or Mahometans; that a government which has hitherto paid so scrupulous, so tender a respect to the rights of conscience, throughout the vast mass of the native population of Hindostan; should now be suspected of having projected a crusade against the whole of that population! That a government, which has hitherto acted so fair, so honourable, so parental a part towards its native subjects, should, without the shadow, the pretence, of even one crumb of evidence, have the credit of a project combining in itself unparalleled baseness and tyranny! Surely, to imagine that such suspicions can be entertained, is a pure flight of imagination! Surely the Shaster itself, among its innumerable legends, contains no fiction more fantastic and extravagant, or, it may be added, more clumsy and ludicrous!

But Major Scott assures us that certain *overt acts* have recently been committed, which lend some colour to these unjust suspicions. One of these was the change of the dress of the native troops, which occasioned the tragedy at Vellore; an absurd measure undoubtedly; and our author of course denies that the public recantation of this overt act by the Madras government, can have the smallest effect in allaying the popular alarm it had excited. If not, what assurance is there, that the public recall of the missionaries will be successful in that respect? If the people are determined to suspect on, against all shadow of probability, every retrograde movement of the ruling powers will only aggravate their suspicions. The gratuitous circulation of the New Testament, and of religious tracts, by the missionaries, is another overt act. Now, wherever this circulation actually took effect, three parties at least must

have been concerned in it; the missionary, who voluntarily gave away a book; the Hindoo, who voluntarily accepted it; and the government, which permitted this change of possession. Unfortunately, Major Scott does not mention which of the three is to be charged with the perpetration of the overt act. The institution of schools for the native children, from which we are told that they ran away as soon as they felt disposed to do so, is another overt act of the same kind, and the property of the crime is left equally undetermined. Another overt act was the unauthorised journey of two of the missionaries from Serampore to Dacca; and this, though they were stopped at Dacca for want of a passport, and actually sent back to Serampore. To crown all, "the novel appearance of *English* missionaries in India was an overt act;" although, in this very same publication, and not ten pages after, the author declares that "missionaries created no alarm in *his* time, nor would they now, were they to act as the Danish and Roman missionaries acted formerly." The manner of acting of these missionaries, we presume, was to avoid the overt act of "appearing in India."

After all this, how is it possible for the Bramins to doubt that government and the missionaries are conspiring against them; and that, in a few years, they will behold Dr. Buchanan, Lord Minto, Dr. Kerr, Mr. Dundas, and the missionaries, adorned with helmets, burning down their idols, plundering their pagodas, inviting them to dine on roast beef, cutting their throats; and finally, Mr. Carey, with a sword in one hand, and the missionary reports in the other, proclaimed primate of India at Benares?

To recur for a moment to a point connected with some of the overt acts enumerated above, Major Scott states, and justly, that by the regulations of the Company, a British subject cannot proceed to India without their permission; and that, in



India, he cannot quit the English settlements of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, to visit the interior country, without a passport. We have inquired a little into this matter, and the result of our inquiry induces us to ask two questions. First, are there not in Calcutta numbers of British subjects, whom the Company never authorised to proceed to that place? Secondly, does Major Scott remember ever to have witnessed another instance of that rigour being shewn to travellers unprovided with a passport, which the missionaries experienced at Dacca, and which, we understand, some of them also experienced at Dinagapore?

When every argument is overthrown or become threadbare, we are then reminded of the weight of local knowledge, and confounded by the name of personal information. For the authority of local information, we have the highest respect; indeed, this authority is the only basis on which our knowledge of every single part of the world must ultimately rest. Yet, on such an occasion as the present, we cannot help thinking, that all ought not to be abandoned to its jurisdiction, and that justice is likely to suffer no less from the decision of an eye-witness\*, than from the conclusions of ingenious but unrestrained speculation. A gentleman may have resided thirty years in India, and yet be totally incompetent to form a correct judgment on the propriety of the recall of the missionaries.

One circumstance of disqualification may be, that he is stronger in facts, than in general principles; and the present question involves both. When Major Scott affirms, that the religious prejudices of a Hindoo are powerful, he affirms what a thousand circumstances that have fallen within his own observation enable and authorise him to attest. But when he pronounces those prejudices to be *invincible*, he is not stating a fact,

\* The great advocates for the humanity of the Slave Trade, were those who had been eye-witnesses of its enormities.

but delivering a hypothesis. How does he know that they are invincible? Did he ever make a series of zealous and well-concerted efforts with the view of conquering them? or even a single serious effort of the kind? Was he ever present when such efforts were made by others? No, but he has heard of such efforts and of their success. If he has only *heard*, his local authority, we are afraid, resolves itself into hearsay, and is not much preferable to our own. But supposing him to have thrown away (for that would be his view of the thing) a life on fruitless endeavours to convert a people, we should still retain our right to question his prediction of the ill-success of all future missionaries in the same field, and might quote against him the innumerable instances on record, in which prejudices of the hardest grain have been, at length, worn away, by the constant dashing of reiterated assaults. The theory, however, of Major Scott, is not simply that the Hindoos will not yield their prejudices to persuasion; but that they will mistake persuasion for force, and a body of unaccredited missionaries for the delegates of the British government. This hypothesis is complex tenfold, and includes a variety of considerations, of which, with all deference to our author, he is by no means a fitter judge than many a home-bred philosopher, who has been content to study mankind *within the four seas*; who has read history, and read life,

“Till old experience does attain  
To something of prophetic strain.”

But what, if we shall refuse to our Anglo-Indians, at least a paramount authority, even on that very ground which their experience may be supposed fairly to cover? Many of our readers have perhaps visited some of the British settlements abroad. To them we appeal, whether our countrymen, residing in those situations, are generally attentive students of all those local peculiarities which constitute the cha-



racter of a place? Whether, on the contrary, they are not, in these respects, the most injurious of mankind? In Hindostan, however, there are some unavoidable aggravations of this phlegmatic indifference. Climate, example, and opportunity, dispose the young Englishman to luxurious indulgence and pleasurable pursuits; and whatever of time or attention is not a gift to pleasure, is a debt to business. The smoothness and plausibility of the Asiatic character please his eye; and it is not easy to penetrate the interior of a society, reserved beyond any on earth. Supposing him to be placed in the situation apparently the most favourable to local observation, that of a distant factory, where he is almost the sole European, he is, in effect, neither more nor less than a petty Asiatic prince, with his Dürbar and his Haram, the contented associate of his acknowledged inferiors, flattered by his subjects, and very little acquainted with their real condition or character. Whatever he sees of Asiatic manners, is beheld, if we may so express it, through the confusing medium of a cloud of incense. He finds the natives knavish indeed; but is soothed with the quiet submission of every detected culprit to his *rattan*. Indulged by them, he indulges them in turn; to their prejudices of Caste he pays the customary, it may now be almost called the *traditional* respect. Always associating the idea of those prejudices with the idea of the native character, they naturally become, in his mind, inseparable; but he has never bestowed an hour upon the enquiry, why the Hindoo or the Mussulman is a bigot, nor has ever seriously examined what is the nature, or what the foundation, of that bigotry, which he pronounces to be invincible. In the mean time, generally speaking, he is still a Christian; but a Christian possibly for the same reason that makes a Bramin a Bramin; it is his *Caste*, and his grandfathers professed the same religion before him. In a practical observance, however, of the

rules of Caste, he does not quite pretend to rival the Bramin. The monitory recurrence of Christian ordinances, the salutary infection of Christian example, the very atmosphere of Christian society; these are powerful assistances to conscience, and these he entirely wants. He insensibly gravitates towards the Asiatic character; which character, however, he still does not know, because he does not know himself. At this crisis, he hears of a Christian missionary, making a pilgrimage of benevolence, directly assailing the prejudices of the natives, and perhaps (for why should not the truth be religiously told?) committing occasional indiscretions, and expressing the noblest sentiments in language homely and repulsive to the ear of a correct taste. What has our Nabob in common with this itinerant? What, rather, that does not rouse his prejudices against a man, whose conduct is a tacit, but bitter satire on his own? He, at once, proscribes him as an enthusiast, and condemns him as an ignorant madman; and indeed it must be confessed, that, if the missionary be not mad, his own sanity runs some risk of being called in question. Contented with the native character as he is, he naturally under-rates the necessity, and over-rates the difficulty of a reformation of it, through the agency of Christian principles. Some similarity to the sketch which we have given, is, we are persuaded, often to be found among our countrymen in the East; both in the civil and in the military service. At the same time, it will not be imagined that we are ignorant of the existence of numerous and most honourable exceptions to it. Still less can it be supposed that our delineation was intended for a portrait; nothing was farther from our thoughts; and, to quell a suspicion, possible in this place, we will declare, that of Major Scott's private history, we know far too little, even to be able, plausibly, to misrepresent it, were we capable of so base and shameful a design.

The application of these remarks



we leave to the reader, while we add a single observation on a point too important to be altogether overlooked. The observation is this, that of the present existence of any politico-religious alarm in India, neither Major Scott, nor any body else, can give the tittle of a proof; for we cannot condescend to fight against private letters, that are talked of, but never produced. The mutiny at Vellore proves nothing; and that for this irresistible reason, that there is not a missionary within many miles of that place. On the contrary, throughout Bengal, where there are many active missionaries, *there never has been the slightest fear of a commotion among the native troops*\*. What then becomes of the supposed horror of a compulsory conversion, which, we are told, that the missionaries every where inspire? To this enquiry, there is, we are confident but one fair answer; and so firmly do we feel convinced of this, that we will not amplify the question, but leave it, thus simply enunciated, to the quiet consideration of Major Scott; not doubting, that it will greatly gravel him in the composition of his next pamphlet, which, otherwise we suspect, would very soon visit the world†.

\* Even on the coast, the latest accounts say, that *all is quiet*.

† The author has done us the honour to employ twenty-six pages of his letter to Mr. Owen, in replying to a note (at the close of the review of Mr. Twining's pamphlet, in our last number,) in which we briefly adverted to his, at that time, anonymous "Observations." Of this reply, we mean to notice, at present, only such parts as are distinct from the general question at issue between us.

We will begin our remarks on it, with frankly admitting, that we were to blame in imputing to the author; improper *motives*; and we feel no hesitation in expressing our regret, that from the hurry in which we wrote, we should have been betrayed into this fault. But while we desire to retract those expressions, which may seem to impeach the author's *motives*, we by no means intend to retract them as applied to his work. We are still of opinion, that that work manifests "a rooted

hostility to the propagation of Christianity;" that its obvious tendency, is "to crush Christianity in India," and, that were we not assured of the contrary, we should still have believed, from the internal evidence, that the respect for religion, which is there professed, was assumed for the purpose of more effectually compassing this object. If the author is no enemy "to the EXTENSION of Christianity in India," (p. 100) we think he has been unfortunate in the choice of the terms he has employed to express his sentiments. We no longer, indeed, consider him as an adept in the school of Voltaire; but we must take the liberty of saying, that his pamphlet might easily be mistaken for one of the productions of that school. As for the discovery which the author has made, that, *in truth*, we are the disciples of Voltaire; it does not seem to require a comment.

A more serious charge, is that of disaffection to the Church. (p. 94) This he grounds on two circumstances; first, our differing very much from the clergy with whom *he* has the honour to associate, (from one of them mentioned by name, we should be sorry to differ widely;) second, our refusing to admit that *all* the clergy are good theologians and pious men. Would Major Scott assert this? Or does he believe, that the best way of counter-acting such men as Mr. Whitfield, and the methodists, is to conceal from the clergy their real faults, or to withhold from them those friendly admonitions which may promote their improvement?

We can see neither "vanity, insolence, nor injustice", (p. 114) in stating our opinion, that, if the East India Company should *obstruct* the introduction of the Gospel into Hindostan, all "who feel that Christianity is God's best gift to man," will be inclined to oppose the renewal of their charter. We verily believe that this will be the case. Nor did we here confine our view, as Major Scott supposes, to any particular party; we extended it to the whole world of Christians, of whatever name, or of whatever sentiments in theology, who agree with us in the general proposition "that Christianity is God's best gift to man." Major Scott, indeed, dexterously endeavours to persuade his readers, that his opponents on this important question consist, exclusively, of those who are called "the evangelical clergy," and "the methodists." Happily for India, this view of the case, however it may suit our author's purpose, may be shewn to be another of his misrepresen-



tations. In that country, for upwards of a century, have missionaries, both European and native, preached and itinerated; have schools for native children been established; have the Scriptures or parts of the Scriptures, and tracts been circulated; in short, have all those means of conversion which Major Scott so severely condemns Dr. Buchanan and Dr. Kerr for even proposing, and the Baptist Missionaries for attempting, been employed, and successfully employed, under the sanction of the venerable society for promoting Christian knowledge (see the reports of that society *passim*). Was Major Scott ignorant of this fact? We should be glad, also, to know, whether Major Scott means to include, among the men whom he denounces as *puritans*, Dr. Barrow, or Mr. Nares, or Mr. Wrangham, the authors, each of an excellent sermon on this subject; or the heads of our two universities, who assigned to these able and respectable divines, the task which they have so well executed; or the lamented name of Sir William Jones; or the honoured name of the present Bishop of London? Were any more evidence wanting to prove the groundlessness of Major Scott's mischievous insinuation, we should refer, with pleasure, to a work from which we have often had the misfortune to differ, but with which we always rejoice to agree; we mean "the

Anti-Jacobin Review." The conductors of that work, in their last number, (p. 392) have expressed their sentiments on this subject, in a manner, which is highly honourable to them. If our limits would have allowed us, we should gladly have quoted the whole of the passage in question. Suffice it to say, that they stigmatize the opinion "that the introduction of Christianity among the natives of India, would only tend to produce a spirit of insubordination, and to render them troublesome subjects," as an "opinion of which it is difficult to say whether the effrontery with which it was avowed, the ignorance which it bespoke, or the Anti-Christian spirit which it betrayed, was best calculated to excite astonishment." "Are men," they proceed to ask, "fit to be entrusted with the government of such a country, who seem to think the souls of their fellow creatures, objects of no concern, and wholly beneath their notice? And they express a confidence, that when our present religious Sovereign, when the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, "whose deep concern for the interests of religion, entitles him to the respect of every religious mind," shall come fully to know the real state of the case, "some step or other will be taken for wiping off this foul stain from our national character."

---

✂ *The Literary and Philosophical Intelligence, the List of New Publications, and the Ecclesiastical Preferments, will be found in the APPENDIX to the last Volume.*

## RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

---

### CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

THE Missionary settlement formed at Zak River, under the superintendence of M. Kicherer, has been abandoned in consequence of the continual droughts which were experienced there, and the depredations of the Boschemen, which render it impracticable to secure a provision for the necessities of the settlers. The Missionaries and their people have removed to *Graaff Reinet*, and the latter have obtained employment from persons who allow them to frequent religious meetings. Some of them are stated even to preach the Gospel to their Fellow-Hottentots, and to the Slaves who live in remote situ-

ations, with more effect than could be expected from Europeans. The number of Slaves and Hottentots who attend religious worship at *Graaff Reinet*, is about one hundred and twenty, and they are said to value highly the privilege of hearing the word of God.

### GUIANA.

In consequence of an invitation from a planter, in Dutch *Guiana*, who states his deep concern, that while he and his brother planters profit so largely by the labour of the negroes, no pains are taken to make them acquainted with "the message from heaven, which offers peace to fallen mankind," the London Missionary Society,



have resolved to send a missionary to Demarara. It is melancholy to reflect, that in this, and the adjoining colonies, of Surinam, Berbice, and Essequibo, containing a population of about 180,000 souls, there are only two ministers, one English, and one Dutch. The negroes are, of course, wholly neglected.

#### NEW SOUTH WALES.

THE chaplain of this colony, the Rev. Mr. Marsden, has lately returned to England, in order to procure, if possible, the necessary means of instruction for its inhabitants. These amount to about ten thousand souls; among whom, Mr. Marsden has laboured singly, for many years. And as they are dispersed in different settlements, which lie widely apart from each other: it may easily be conceived that their spiritual interests can be but little attended to. It appears an extraordinary circumstance, that with all the zeal which has been manifested in this country for missionary attempts, in every quarter of the globe, so small a portion of that zeal should be directed to our wretched countrymen, whose crimes have led to their exile, and who, therefore, must be acknowledged peculiarly fit objects for the labours of His ministers, who come "not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Nor is it less extraordinary, that while our political men admit reformation to be one great end of penal inflictions, and while a large expence is incurred for the civil government, and for the coercion of these out-casts from our society, the only expence incurred by our government, for the moral and religious improvement of these unhappy persons and their numerous progeny, should be the salary paid to a single chaplain. The number of children standing in need of instruction, amounts to upwards of two thousand. We understand that government is now so fully convinced of the duty of providing for the spiritual wants of this colony, that they are willing to enlarge considerably the clerical establishment, and to give salaries to an adequate number of schoolmasters, to be employed in the instruction of the youth. We trust, that suitable persons will be found to fill these offices; otherwise it will be vain to expect that the moral and religious state of the settlement, which is at present deplorably low, should be ameliorated. It deserves to be mentioned, that the noted Barrington, who was removed to this distant region on account of his crimes, was one of the few who exhibited the marks of a real reformation. His conduct and conversa-

tion, during the last seven or eight years of his life, were those of a consistent christian, and in the discharge of his office of high constable, he always manifested an exemplary fidelity.

A chief of New Zealand, had paid a visit of some months to the principal settlement in New South Wales, a short time before Mr. Marsden quitted the colony. He appeared to be a man of considerable acuteness, and of an active and enquiring mind, and his remarks on what he saw and heard, were shrewd and pertinent. He shewed a strong desire to transplant some of the arts of Europe to New Zealand, and was anxious to engage persons in his service, who might aid him in promoting that desirable object. His solicitude to benefit his country, was strikingly manifested, in the pains which he took to propagate the potatoe. A single potatoe had been left with him, some years ago. He personally superintended its culture, preserved and replanted its produce, till the island is at length filled with that valuable article of food. The same laudable solicitude induced him to entrust his son, a youth about seventeen or eighteen years of age, to the care of the master of a South-sea whaler, by whom he might be brought to England, with a view to the acquisition of knowledge, which might be useful to him in after-life. The young man is now in this country; but we greatly fear that he labours under disadvantages, which will serve materially to disappoint, if not wholly to frustrate the enlightened views of his father.

#### TARTARY.

THE last accounts from the missionaries at Kars, are dated on the 26th Oct. 1807. We will give a few extracts from their letters.

"We had lately a visit from the governor of the province. He was accompanied by the vice-governor, and a Kabardian chief. I presented to his excellency all the members of our family, dressed in their best clothes. He and his companions seemed much pleased with their appearance, and particularly with the young natives, whose condition is so different from that of the youth around us. They were much struck with our printing apparatus, and expressed the greatest satisfaction with all they saw. We had a good deal of interesting conversation, and after spending a great part of the day with us, they set out for the warm baths.

"We are desirous, and not without hopes, of getting acquainted with the peo-



ple in the mountains, among whom any spark of Christianity remains unextinguished. The Kabardians lie betwixt us and them, and are a great scourge to these people. Shellivy has offered his services in this affair, and proposes to do what he can to open a communication betwixt us and the Samno people.

"With regard to Kateray\*, he goes on steadily, walking consistently with his profession, and manifesting the greatest zeal for the success of our mission. Last night I told him that I was going to write to you, and asked if he had any thing to say to you. On which he went into Mr. Fraser's house, and in a short time handed me a note, of which the following is a literal translation:

"Peace to my honoured friend. I have been glad since I received your salutation, and heard of your welfare: I always pray to God for your welfare, and shall do so while I live. Besides you and Brunton, I have no better friends in the world: I walked in ignorance, blindness, and misery; but ever since I discerned the truth of the religion of God, I have believed it without doubting, and daily give thanks to God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. I pray to God to make those to hear, who have never heard; and to make those to believe, who have never believed.

"KATERAY."

"A few days ago some Kabardians came to our place, bringing along with them a young lad whom they had stolen from one of the tribes that inhabit the mountains. They came upon him when he was looking after some sheep or cattle, and blindfolded him, that he might not know by what road they brought him. After they got to some distance from the place where they seized him, they travelled with him in the night, and kept him confined through the day. He belongs to a people called *Dugours*,

\* The young Sultan, who has embraced Christianity.

who still retain the name of Christian, and who hold the Mohammedans in abhorrence. When he heard we were Christians, he was exceedingly happy, and shewed the greatest reluctance at leaving us. Mrs. Davidson and B. Wood understood his language, and conversed with him a considerable time. We were greatly moved at the thought of allowing him to remain in the hands of these wicked people, and therefore made proposals to them for his liberty. In this we at last succeeded, and brought back the poor fellow, almost in raptures at escaping from their hands.

"At present the members of our little settlement are all in tolerable health. The poor people around us are very wicked, and for the most part shew the greatest unwillingness to listen to the words of eternal life. But the young natives who live with us are very promising. Some of them, besides their mother-tongue, can read and write both English and Turkish.

"During the summer we were much threatened by our neighbours; and alarming symptoms of the plague, which, however, have always been subdued, appeared among us. The plague is still raging around us; and the large village near us is almost depopulated. Perhaps religious persecution was never more violent than in this country. The life of Kateray has been eagerly sought, but he has persevered with firmness. Several other chiefs and priests have acknowledged their conviction of the truth of Christianity, and have expressed an inclination to embrace it, but they have been kept back by fear of the consequences. We have this year baptized seven natives."

"If you wish to do us a friendly turn, prevail on some of your rich friends to contribute for the express purpose of ransoming a few children. If our settlement be supported, it will eventually spread the Gospel through these populous mountains."

## VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

### CONTINENTAL INTELLIGENCE.

In the official paper of France there has appeared a long commentary on his Majesty's declaration, in answer to that of Russia, which is an acute and ingenious performance. It denies, in express terms, the existence of any secret articles injurious to the interests of England, in the

treaty entered into at Tilsit, between Russia and France, and labours with much plausibility to shew that our government, at the moment they pretended to make the knowledge they had obtained of these articles, the ground of their justification of the attack on Copenhagen, did, in fact, possess no such



knowledge; because, if they had certainly known and believed that Russia had entered into engagements hostile to England, they would not have permitted the Russian fleet to clear the straits of Gibraltar, or three Russian ships of war to pass through the English squadron which blockaded Copenhagen; nor would they have applied to Russia to mediate between this country and Denmark. This, we think the main point in the French commentary, and it doubtless rests on our government to give to it a clear and satisfactory reply.

The non-existence of any secret articles which affected England is again asserted, in order to shew that our rejection of the Russian mediation, on the ground that the Emperor Alexander had refused to communicate them to us, was absurd and preposterous. The Emperor, it is said, flatly denied that any such articles had been framed.

In what is said respecting Prussia, and our conduct towards that power, there is much palpable mis-statement and obvious sophistry. We are not sure that the commentator is liable to a like censure in pointing out what might have been done, by a judicious application of our naval and military force, in aiding the efforts of our allies. He denies, *in toto*, the truth of the statements in his Majesty's declaration, respecting the severities exercised by the French in Prussia. The terms which, it is said, France and Russia propose to demand for Denmark, are, that her fleet should be restored; that reparation should be made to the Prince; that the person who advised the expedition should be given up; that the houses destroyed should be rebuilt at the expence of Great Britain; and that his Majesty should disavow the outrage.

The only point of any interest, besides those which we have mentioned, respects the principles of maritime law. In one part of the paper it is strongly stated, that France will not lay down her arms till she has conquered the freedom of the seas. Towards the close of the paper, however, a much more moderate tone is assumed, and it is only required that England should not insist, as a condition of peace, on the formal acknowledgment of her principles of maritime law: It is not wanted in time of peace; and in time of war, the belligerent nations will exercise what they conceive to be their belligerent rights, provided they can do so with safety. The inference of the commentator is, that this question need not

for a moment retard the blessing of peace; and he proceeds to observe, that this ground of debate being removed, there exists no longer, even on our own admission, any obstacle to peace; as his Majesty has declared that his last negotiation with France was broken off on points which affected immediately, not the interests of Great Britain, but those of Russia; and Russia is now at peace with France.

Our recent Orders of Council, regulating the trade of neutrals with places subject to France, have excited, as might have been expected, the vehement indignation of Bonaparte. He has issued a counter decree, by which he *denationalizes* every ship, to whatever nation belonging, which shall have even submitted to be searched by an English ship, or to be carried to England, or which shall have paid any tax to the English government; that is, he declares such ship to have forfeited the protection of its king, to have become English property, and to be good and lawful prize, wherever found, at sea or in port. The barbarity of this decree has, we believe, no parallel, except in those institutions of the Hindoo religion which doom its votaries, and their posterity for ever, to loss of caste, and to all the degradation and wretchedness attending it, on account of pollutions involuntarily contracted. Bonaparte proceeds to declare the British islands in a state of blockade, by land and sea; and every ship of whatever nation, sailing to or from Great Britain, or any of its dependencies, good and lawful prize. This decree is accompanied by a letter of the Minister of the Interior to the Chambers of Commerce, in which he observes that the late measures of the British government, measures, which render the ocean only the field of slavery, will clog much more than ever the commerce of the Continent, and will subject it to many severe privations; and he exhorts them to make up their minds to struggle with these new difficulties. Two channels, however, are stated still to remain open. First, an extensive system of privateering against all vessels going to or coming from England, or her colonies. This, together with the enterprize of neutrals, who, it is to be hoped, will still be able to elude the vigilance of the English cruizers, will form a considerable source of supply. Second, internal industry. Indigenous cotton, hemp, and flax, will be substituted for imported materials. New dyes will be in-



vented, &c. Besides, is it to be supposed, he adds, that the Great Nation will be intimidated at the idea of a few privations, when it considers what its armies have endured, and when it has in view to conquer the independence of the seas, to redeem commerce from piracy, and to vindicate the national honour? A subsequent paper pretends to lament the miseries which England is bringing on herself by her fatal orders, and feelingly recommends that, for the sake of her trade and manufactures, and of her starving population, they should be immediately revoked. Great pains are also taken to inspire America to resist their execution; and here, we fear, that Bonaparte will be more successful.

Bonaparte returned to Paris, from Venice, about Christmas. His return was unexpected, and we apprehend that some circumstances must have occurred, to shorten his stay in Italy, much more than was at first intended. Otherwise, he appears to have undertaken a very long journey, at an inconvenient season, to little purpose. As far as the public is acquainted with his proceedings, nothing beyond the interchange of complimentary speeches has taken place during his tour, if we except a decree, adopting Prince Eugene for his son, and appointing him heir to the crown of Italy, in default of children of his own. Should Eugene have no son, the crown will devolve to the nearest relative of such prince of his blood, as shall then reign in France; but neither he nor his descendants are to urge any pretensions to the crown of France.

A new constitution has been given to Westphalia by Bonaparte. It is announced in a proclamation of King Jerome, as the fruit of the meditations of a great man, and of the experience of a great nation. One of its provisions, is the equality of modes of religion. He tells his subjects, that they have at length obtained that first of blessings, a country. "Your master," he adds, "is now the law; your protector the monarch who is to cause it to be respected; henceforth you shall have no other." This is all very fine.

The French are in complete possession of Portugal. No opposition appears to have been made to the entrance of their troops into Lisbon; but, that city, and indeed the whole kingdom, is said to be greatly distressed for provisions. Bonaparte affects to commiserate the fate of the

house of Braganza, although while he thought them in his power, he had publicly sentenced them to degradation and ruin, for having permitted themselves to be so far deluded by the misrepresentations of England, as unnecessarily to expatriate themselves, and, from an unfounded apprehension of danger, to seek a remote asylum. He affects, also, to promise to France, immense commercial advantages, from this ill-advised measure of the Prince of Brazil. At present, however, the commercial advantages of an intercourse with South America, are likely to be entirely on the side of the English. A provisional arrangement has already been made with the Portuguese ambassador, for the reception of our ships at Rio de Janeiro, which is to be in force, until a regular commercial treaty shall have been negotiated between the two powers; and a great many licences have already been granted by the Privy Council, authorising the transmission of our manufactures to that river. The ports of Portugal and Spain are placed under a rigid blockade.

It continues to be affirmed that a large French army, amounting by report to 140,000 men, is drawing towards Gibraltar, with a view to besiege that fortress.

#### MADEIRA.

THE island of Madeira capitulated in the month of December last, to his Majesty's forces under General Beresford and Sir Samuel Hood, without any resistance. The terms of capitulation stipulate for the restoration of the island to Portugal, whenever that kingdom shall regain its independence, and return to its relations of amity with this country; and in the mean time, no change shall be made in the religion, laws, and property of the inhabitants. In considering the propriety of these terms, it ought to be recollected, that the orders for the capture of this island went hence, before it was known that the Prince Regent would emancipate himself, as he has done, from the power of the French, and while our commerce was shut out from Portugal, by virtue of his decree.

#### UNITED STATES.

THE question of peace or war between America and Great Britain, still remains undecided. The violence, however, of the popular clamour against this country; the tone which the congress have assumed in their deliberations; the known partialities and antipathies of the President; and the preponderating influence which France seems to possess with those who administer



the government; (and all these causes are assisted in their operation by the number of disaffected British subjects, who have emigrated to America, and by strong feelings of commercial rivalry) afford too much ground for anticipating a rupture. The non-importation act has been put in force, but the power of suspending it is vested in the President. An embargo has also been laid on their own shipping, but this appears to be only a measure of precaution. The affair of the Chesapeake has been vehemently condemned; and the President is empowered to prevent the entrance into the American waters of the armed ships of foreign nations. The orders of council on the subject of neutral commerce, had not reached America, when the last accounts left that country. These will probably produce fresh exasperation, unless the disproportionate severity of the French counter-decrees should have the effect of abating the feeling of animosity towards England. A short time must now determine this important question, a question so nearly affecting the happiness and prosperity, not only of England and America, but of the whole civilized world.

#### GREAT BRITAIN.

THE length to which we have been unavoidably led in reviewing Major Scott's recent publications\*, will prevent our doing more than merely noticing the meeting of Parliament, on the 21st inst.

The King's Speech, at the opening of the Session, was in substance as follows, viz.

No sooner had the peace of Tilsit confirmed the controul of France over the Continent, than his Majesty was apprised of the intention of the enemy to form a general confederacy against this kingdom, and to force into hostility states which had hitherto been allowed to maintain or to purchase their neutrality: and to bring against us the whole of the naval force of Europe, and specifically the fleets of Portugal and Denmark. To place those fleets out of the power of such a confederacy, became therefore the duty of his Majesty. In the execution of this duty, as far as related to the Danish fleet, it was with the deepest reluctance that his Majesty found himself compelled, after his earnest endeavours to negotiate had failed, to resort to force. The course his Majesty had to pursue with respect to Portugal, was of a

nature more congenial to his feelings. The timely communication of the demands and designs of France, while it confirmed the advices received from other quarters, entitled that court to his Majesty's confidence. The fleet of Portugal, which was to be employed as an instrument of vengeance against Great Britain, has been secured from the grasp of France, and is now conveying to America the hopes and fortunes of the Portuguese monarchy. His Majesty implores the protection of Divine Providence upon that enterprise, rejoicing in the preservation and prospects of a power so long the friend and ally of Great Britain. The determination of the enemy to excite Russia, Austria, and Prussia to hostilities, has been but too successful; and the ministers from those powers have received their passports. Russia has attempted to justify herself by a statement of wrongs which have no foundation: Russia, indeed, offered to mediate between his Majesty and France. His Majesty did not refuse, but declined to accept it till he should ascertain that Russia was in a condition to mediate impartially, and until the principles on which France was ready to negotiate, were made known. No pretence can be alleged for the hostile conduct of Austria or Prussia, nor have they assigned any distinct cause for it. Copies of the official notes which passed, pending the negotiations at Tilsit, of those which respect the offer of mediation, and also of the official notes of the Austrian ministers, and the answers returned to them, shall be laid before parliament. His Majesty's endeavours to effect a peace with Turkey, have been defeated by the machinations of France. But while the influence of France has been thus successful in other quarters, the King of Sweden has resisted every attempt to induce him to abandon his alliance with Great Britain; and his Majesty entertains no doubt that parliament will feel the duty which is thus imposed upon his Majesty: and will concur in enabling his Majesty to discharge it in a manner worthy of this country. The treaty with America has not taken effect, the President of the United States having refused to ratify it. For an unauthorised act of force against an American ship of war, his Majesty offered spontaneous reparation. But the American government have tried to connect with this act, pretensions inconsistent with the maritime rights of Great Britain, and which cannot be admitted; his Majesty, nevertheless, hopes that America will be actuated by a desire to preserve peace, and that any difficulties

\* One of them, the Letter to Mr. Owen, was published on the 21st or 22d instant.

in the discussion may be removed. In consequence of the French decree of blockade, his Majesty resorted, first, to a measure of mitigated retaliation; and this having proved ineffectual, he has since adopted others of greater rigour, which will require the aid of parliament to give them complete operation. Notwithstanding the difficulties imposed on commerce, the resources of the country, in the last year, have produced, both from the permanent and temporary revenue, a receipt considerably larger than that of the preceding year; and his Majesty confidently hopes, it will be possible to raise the necessary supplies for the present year without any material addition to the public burthens.

In conclusion, it is said, "that, if ever there was a just and national war, it is that which his Majesty is now compelled to prosecute. This war is in its principle purely defensive. His Majesty looks but to the attainment of a secure and honorable peace: but such a peace can only be negotiated upon a footing of perfect equality. The eyes of Europe and the world are fixed upon the British parliament. If, as his Majesty confidently trusts, you display, in this crisis of the fate of the country, the characteristic spirit of the British nation, and face unappalled the unnatural combination which is gathered around us, his Majesty bids us to assure you of his firm persuasion, that under the blessing of Divine Providence, the struggle will prove

successful and glorious to Great Britain. We are lastly commanded to assure you, that in this awful and momentous contest, you may rely on the firmness of his Majesty, who has no cause but that of his people, and that his Majesty reciprocally relies on the wisdom, the constancy, and the affectionate support of his parliament."

The address of both houses was, as usual, an echo to the speech. It passed without a division, but not without a long debate, in which Lord Grenville and Lord Sidmouth, in the House of Lords; and Mr. Ponsonby, Mr. Whitbread, and Lord H. Petty, in the House of Commons; opened the general grounds on which they disapproved the conduct of ministry, in the different transactions referred to in the speech. The attack on Copenhagen, formed the most prominent topic of discussion; and here we must confess ourselves to be by no means satisfied with the scantiness of the information which ministers seem disposed to afford the public, on this important point. We fully admit, that there may be danger in revealing the sources of their intelligence; but there can be no danger in satisfying a secret committee of upright and impartial men, that they were in possession of intelligence which will amount to a justification of the measure.

Wednesday, the 17th day of February, is appointed to be observed as a day of fasting and humiliation.

---

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

---

We assure PHILALETHES, that, till he informed us of the fact, we did not know that the persons, whose case Mr. Balfour described, were Wesleyan Methodists. Our censures had no reference to the sect of the persons in question.

We are sorry that we are yet unable to gratify SCRUTANS S.S. We do not make ourselves at all responsible for the papers sent to us.

J. B. P.; BRADLEY; and FRIVOLA, have been received.

We do not agree with L. N.

The paper of A. H. Z. is returned.

In our next, Mr. FABER in reply to Talib.

The printed letter from J. S. Hull, will be attended to in due time.

We do not know to what paper Miss S. alludes. She must mention the signature.

We have received the paper of N. S. and are particularly gratified by his private communication. We render thanks to the giver of all good.

---

## ERRATA.

Present No. p. 18, col. 2, l. 8 from bottom, for *care* read *case*.

p. 24, col. 2, l. 15, for *action* read *active*.